

AD-A103 430

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS CENTER CAMBRIDGE MA  
A STUDY OF OIL SPILL RATES IN FOUR U.S. COASTAL REGIONS.(U)  
JUN 80 J F BELLANTONI  
TSC-USC0-80-3

F/6 13/2

UNCLASSIFIED

USC0-D-26-81

NL

1 OF 2  
AD  
A/O 8430



D  
/03

REPORT NO. CG-D-26-81/

BS  
① LEVEL II

A STUDY OF OIL SPILL RATES  
IN FOUR U.S. COASTAL REGIONS

J.F. BELLANTONI

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION  
Transportation Systems Center  
Cambridge MA 02142



DTIC  
ELECTE  
S AUG 28 1981 D  
B

FINAL REPORT

DOCUMENT IS AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC  
THROUGH THE NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE, SPRINGFIELD,  
VIRGINIA 22161

Prepared for

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
UNITED STATES COAST GUARD  
Office of Marine Environment and Systems  
Washington DC 20593

DTIC FILE COPY

80 8 28 134

(18) USCG-D

(19) 26-81

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. CG-D-26-81 ✓	2. Government Accession No. AD-A103430	3. Recipient's Catalog No. .
4. Title and Subtitle A STUDY OF OIL SPILL RATES IN FOUR U.S. COASTAL REGIONS	5. Report Date	6. Performing Organization Code
7. Author(s) J.F. Bellantoni	8. Performing Organization Report No. TSC-USCG-80-3 ✓	9. Performing Organization Name and Address U.S. Department of Transportation Research and Special Programs Administration Transportation Systems Center Cambridge MA 02142
10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS) CG022/R0008	11. Contract or Grant No. J11 Jun 80	12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address U.S. Department of Transportation U.S. Coast Guard Office of Marine Environment and Systems Washington DC 20593
13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report May 1979 - June 1980	14. Sponsoring Agency Code	15. Supplementary Notes
16. Abstract A comparison of the rates of incidence of oil spills over 10,000 gallons in the years 1974 through 1977 was made for four regions in the United States that carry heavy oil traffic: Greater New York - New Jersey, Delaware Bay, the Louisiana Coast, and the Northern Texas Coast. The spill data for the study were drawn from the Pollution Incident Reporting System (PIRS), the records of the National Response Center (NRC), and the Vessel Casualty Reporting System (VCS). Oil movement data were obtained from the Army Corps of Engineers, Waterborne Commerce of the United States. The spill rates calculated for the four regions showed no significant differences. However, a significantly higher spill rate was noted for the Hudson River sub-division of the New York - New Jersey region. An examination of the spill reports showed that most of the spills were associated with poor weather conditions (viz., ice, fog). A partial study was also made of spills in the Mississippi, Illinois, and Ohio Rivers. It was found that the spill rates in the Ohio River were significantly higher than in the Mississippi or Illinois Rivers or in the coastal regions.		
17. Key Words Oil Spill, Oil Spill Rates, Pollution, Coastal Oil Spills, Coast Guard, PIRS, National Response Center, Vessel Casualty, Statistics	18. Distribution Statement DOCUMENT IS AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC THROUGH THE NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE, SPRINGFIELD, VIRGINIA 22161	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified	20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified	21. No. of Pages 160
22. Price		

407082 i/ii

-i-

JCB



## PREFACE


This memorandum reports on work undertaken by the Office of Air and Marine Systems of the Transportation Systems Center for the U.S. Coast Guard Office of Marine Environment and Systems, under Project Plan Agreement CG 915. The task covered by this report was initiated in October 1978 and completed in May 1979.

The assistance of CDR J. Valenti, Lt. M. Tobbe, Lt. CDR J. Clow, CDR W. Ecker, and of Ensigns R. Miller and M. Ives of the U.S. Coast Guard is acknowledged with appreciation.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
<b>A</b>	

# METRIC CONVERSION FACTORS

Approximate Conversions to Metric Measures			
Symbol	When You Know	Multiply by	To find
LENGTH			
in	inches	2.5	centimeters
ft	feet	30	centimeters
y	yards	0.9	meters
m	miles	1.6	kilometers
AREA			
sq in	square inches	6.5	square centimeters
sq ft	square feet	0.09	square meters
sq yd	square yards	0.8	square meters
sq mi	square miles	2.6	square kilometers
ac	acres	0.4	hectares
MASS (weight)			
oz	ounces	28	grams
lb	pounds	0.45	kilograms
sh wt (2000 lb)	short tons	0.9	metric tons
VOLUME			
fl oz	liquid ounces	30	milliliters
pt	pints	480	milliliters
qt	quarts	950	milliliters
gal	gallons	3.8	liters
cu ft	cubic feet	0.028	cubic meters
cu yd	cubic yards	0.76	cubic meters
TEMPERATURE (exact)			
F	Fahrenheit temperature	$(F - 32) \times \frac{5}{9}$	Celsius temperature
C	Celsius temperature	$C \times \frac{9}{5} + 32$	Fahrenheit temperature



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.2 Background.....	1
1.2 Objective.....	2
2. DEFINITION OF THE FOUR REGIONS.....	5
3. EXPANSION OF THE SPILL DATA BASE.....	8
3.1 Selection Criteria.....	8
3.2 Pollution Incident Reporting System (PIRS) Data..	9
3.3 National Response Center (NRC) Central Reporting Facility Data.....	17
3.4 Combined PIRS and NRC Data - Unrecorded Spills..	16
3.5 Commercial Vessel Casualty File (CVCF).....	25
4. EXPOSURE VARIABLE DATA.....	28
4.1 Oil Movement as an Exposure Variable.....	28
4.2 Vessel Trips as an Exposure Variable.....	32
4.3 Tabulations.....	33
5. SPILL RATES.....	38
5.1 Spills per Million Tons.....	38
5.2 Vessel-Related Spills per Million Tons.....	41
5.3 Vessel-Related Spills per Vessel Trip.....	42
5.4 Other Spill Rates.....	49
5.5 Analysis of Spill Rates.....	49
5.5.1 Under-Reporting of Exposure.....	50
5.5.2 Over-Reporting of Spills.....	52
5.6 Hudson River Spills.....	56
6. SUMMARY OF RESULTS.....	63
APPENDIX A - OIL SPILLS OF 10,000 GALLONS OR MORE IN FOUR COASTAL REGIONS OF THE UNITED STATES 1974-1977.....	A-1
APPENDIX B - ESTIMATION OF THE NUMBER OF OIL SPILLS WITH INFORMATION FROM TWO SOURCES.....	B-1

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
APPENDIX C - MOVEMENT OF CRUDE, HEAVY, AND LIGHT OILS IN 1974-1977 FOR FOUR GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS OF THE UNITED STATES.....	C-1
APPENDIX D - TRIPS OF TANKERS, TANK BARGES, AND ALL VESSELS IN 1974-1977 FOR FOUR GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS OF THE UNITED STATES.....	D-1
APPENDIX E - A BRIEF DISCUSSION OF THREE TECHNIQUES TO ESTIMATE OIL SPILL RATES FROM HISTORIC DATA.....	E-1
APPENDIX F - SIGNIFICANCE TESTING FOR POISSON PROCESSES.....	F-1
APPENDIX G - OIL SPILL RATES IN SELECTED WESTERN RIVERS.....	G-1
REFERENCES.....	R-1

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
3-1. PIRS Data Form (Page 1).....	11
5-1. Hudson River Oil Movement, 1974-77, ACOE Data....	51
A-1. Greater New York and Delaware Bay Regions.....	A-1
A-2. Louisiana Coast and North Texas Coast Regions....	A-2
B-1. Population Estimation Technique.....	B-2
B-2. Probability $p_3$ of a Spill being recorded vs. Transfer Probability, $\tau$ .....	B-10
E-1. Illustration of Two Spill Rate Estimation Techniques.....	E-5

# LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
3-1. SPILL CLASSIFICATION.....	12
3-2. ANALYSIS OF PIRS SPILL RECORDS - JANUARY 1974- DECEMBER 1977.....	14
3-3. PIRS AND NRC SPILLS OVER 10,000 GALLONS, 1974-77 NEW YORK.....	17
3-4. PIRS AND NRC SPILLS OVER 10,000 GALLONS, 1974-77 DELAWARE BAY.....	18
3-5. PIRS AND NRC SPILLS OVER 10,000 GALLONS, 1974-77 LOUISIANA COAST.....	19
3-6. PIRS AND NRC SPILLS OVER 10,000 GALLONS, 1974-77 NORTH TEXAS COAST.....	20
3-7. PIRS AND NRC SPILLS OVER 10,000 GALLONS, 1974-77 ALL FOUR REGIONS.....	21
3-8. SPILLS RECORDED BY PIRS AND NRC.....	22
4-1. SPILL SOURCES AND OIL MOVEMENT TYPES.....	29
4-2. SPILL SOURCES AND VESSEL MOVEMENT TYPES.....	30
4-3. ANALYSIS OF U.S. OIL MOVEMENT BY VESSEL TYPE.....	31
4-4. OIL MOVEMENT FOR FOUR COASTAL REGIONS, BY YEAR <sup>(1)</sup> ...	34
4-5. OIL MOVEMENT FOR FOUR COASTAL REGIONS, BY CARRIAGE <sup>(1)</sup>	35
4-6. VESSEL TRIPS FOR FOUR COASTAL REGIONS, 1974-77 <sup>(1)</sup>	36
5-1. OVERALL SPILL RATES, 1974-77 (SPILLS PER MILLION TONS).....	39
5-2. SIGNIFICANCE TEST RESULTS <sup>(1)</sup> FOR ALL SPILLS IN THE FOUR REGIONS, EXCLUDING THE HUDSON RIVER.....	40
5-3. VESSEL-RELATED SPILL RATES, 1974-77 (SPILLS PER MILLION TONS).....	43
5-4. SIGNIFICANCE TESTS <sup>(1)</sup> FOR VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS IN FOUR REGIONS, EXCLUDING THE HUDSON RIVER.....	44
5-5. VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS PER TRIP, 1974-77.....	45

# LIST OF TABLES (CONT.)

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
5-6. SIGNIFICANCE TESTS <sup>(1)</sup> FOR VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS PER THOUSAND TANKER AND BARGE TRIPS, IN FOUR REGIONS, EXCLUDING THE HUDSON RIVER.....	46
5-7. OIL TONNAGE PER TANKER OR BARGE TRIP IN FOUR REGIONS.....	47
5-8. ESTIMATED PERCENT UNREPORTED SPILLS, AUGUST 1974 - DECEMBER 1977.....	53
5-9. TOTAL ESTIMATED SPILLS, ALL REGIONS, 1974-77.....	54
5-10. TOTAL ESTIMATED SPILL RATES, ALL REGIONS, 1974-77.	55
5-11. SIGNIFICANCE TESTS FOR TOTAL ESTIMATED SPILLS, ALL REGIONS, 1974-77.....	57
5-12. ANALYSIS OF HUDSON RIVER SPILLS, <sup>(1)</sup> 1974-1977.....	58
5-13. COMPARISON OF GROUNDINGS, COLLISIONS AND MARINE FACILITY SPILLS IN HUDSON RIVER WITH OTHER REGIONS <sup>(1)</sup> .....	59
B-1. INDEPENDENT AND COMBINED RECORDING PROBABILITIES..	B-7
D-1. WATERWAYS IN THE NEW YORK CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT, ACOE DATA.....	D-2
D-2. LOUISIANA INLAND WATERWAYS.....	D-3

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 BACKGROUND

The United States Coast Guard has long been involved in the protection of the marine environment against spills of oil and other injurious substances.<sup>(1)</sup> The Water Quality Improvement Act (1970) and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, however, gave the Coast Guard extensive responsibilities in the prevention, enforcement, surveillance, response, abatement, and impact assessment of oil spills. These responsibilities fall under the USCG Marine Environment Protection (MEP) program. The need for comprehensive oil spill statistics was soon recognized by the U.S. Coast Guard, which established the Pollution Incident Reporting System (PIRS) in December 1971. Soon after the 1972 legislation, and in compliance with it, the National Response Center (NRC) was established. The NRC includes a Central Reporting System for oil and hazardous materials.<sup>(2)</sup> The accumulation by PIRS and NRC of detailed oil spill data since 1971 opens several possibilities for quantitative management techniques. (See, for example, Reference 2). Some of the uses of these data are (a) evaluation of effectiveness of proposed MEP measures,<sup>(3)</sup> (b) evaluation of effectiveness of measures previously put in force, and (c) program and budget planning.

Many analyses can be accomplished using oil spill data alone. A few methods, however, require rate data, i.e., spill data

---

(1) The Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, which prohibits the dumping of refuse in U.S. navigable waters, is jointly administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; the Department of Justice and the U.S. Coast Guard. The term 'refuse' has been interpreted by the courts to include oil.

(2) The Central Reporting System is required by the Hazardous Materials Transportation Control Act of 1970.

(3) As an example of this application, see Reference 1.

normalized to some exposure measure such as petroleum movement, production, use, or storage. The major uses to which rate information has been put are spill prediction or projection, and comparative risk studies.

Spill projection methods were developed extensively in the early 1970's by Devanney and Stewart (References 3,4 and 5) in order to provide an assessment of offshore oil development risks. They derived the posterior distribution of the number of spills that would occur for an expected future exposure, given historical spills and exposure. In practice, this distribution (the negative binomial) is very close to a Poisson distribution using the historical spill rate as a parameter. Needless to mention, spill projection methods derive their usefulness from the knowledge (or estimates) of anticipated change in the underlying exposure variable. Thus, the impact on oil spills of increased oil imports may be estimated by these methods.

In comparative risk studies the emphasis is on the differences of spill rates, such as occur from one transport method to another, or from one geographic area to another. To make the comparison meaningful, the same or equivalent exposure variables must be used in both cases. This technique has been conspicuous in the tanker/pipeline controversy (Reference 6), in the U.S./foreign flag tanker question (Reference 7) and in offshore/onshore production risk comparisons. A recent study has shown (Reference 8) differences in rates of occurrence of spills over 50,000 gallons from one part of the U.S. coastal area to another. Such differences, if they exist, may provide insight into different MEP measures, shipping practices, geography, navigational aids or other characteristics that vary from one coastal area to another. It is the investigation of these regional spill rate differences that motivates the present report.

## 1.2 OBJECTIVE

The present study deals with spill rates in the New York, Delaware Bay, Louisiana and North Texas regions of the U.S.



coast, as employed in Reference 8. The purpose is to determine what differences, if any, exist in the spill rates for the four regions when a larger set of spills (i.e., spills over 10,000 gallons) is considered, and to analyze the possible causes of such differences.

Spill rates were obtained for the four regions in Reference 8 by dividing the number of spills in the region in 1974-77, as contained in the Major Oil Spill Information System (MOSIS) file, by an estimate of the total tonnage of waterborne oil movement in the same region and time period. The MOSIS file is a composite of spills over 50,000 gallons extracted from the U.S. Coast Guard Pollution Incident Reporting System (PIRS) and the National Response Center (NRC) files. The oil movement in the regions was estimated from Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) data (Reference 9) on Waterborne Commerce of the United States.

The least square fits to the regional spill and throughput data, as given in Reference 8, Section 3.3.1.2, are as follows:

Greater New York:	$n = -0.171 + 0.0212 V$
Delaware Bay:	$n = 0.0627 V$
Louisiana Coast	$n = 0.852 + 0.0682 V$
North Texas Coast:	$n = 0.818 + 0.0193 V,$

where  $n$  is the number of spills and  $V$  is the oil throughput volume in millions of short tons. These estimates are affected not only by the restriction on spill size (only spills over 50,000 gallons) but also by the geographic limits taken to define the regions, and by the selection of type of spill (vessel, transfer, pipeline, onshore, etc.) and by the type of oil movement considered.

The first step taken in this report will be to refine the definitions of the four regions. The next, and most important, step will be to expand the data base of spills to encompass all spills over 10,000 gallons in the four regions in the calendar years 1974-77. Then, the oil movement data will be analyzed and various exposure data developed. From the spill data and the exposure data, the corresponding spill rates will be calculated.

Finally, the possible causal factors will be analyzed and the significance of the results ascertained.

The above steps are carried out in the remainder of this report, as follows:

- Section 2: Definition of the Four Regions
- Section 3: Expansion of the Spill Data Base
- Section 4: Analysis of Exposure Variable Data
- Section 5: Calculation of Spill Rates
- Section 6: Discussion of Results.

In addition to the four regions, a calculation of spill rates was carried out for the major Western Rivers. The results are reported in Appendix G of this report.

## 2. DEFINITION OF THE FOUR REGIONS

The four regions were selected in Reference 8 because the large number of spills and heavy oil movement within them offered the best prospects for statistically significant results. In this section the four regions are defined more precisely. The definitions take into account three considerations:

- a. The boundaries of the regions should be clear enough that any spill may be classified unambiguously as being within a region or not. Moreover, a clear-cut boundary will allow one to identify those spills that are marginally in or out of the region, thus facilitating a sensitivity analysis of the regional boundaries.
- b. Regional boundaries should be chosen, as far as possible, to encompass entire waterways, as defined in the ACOE Waterborne Commerce data, which is the major source of oil movement data to be employed.
- c. Boundaries should coincide with the meridians and parallels to facilitate computer sort of the PIRS data on latitude and longitude.

The four regions are illustrated in Figures A-1 and A-2 in Appendix A and are described as follows:

### Greater New York

Latitude 40° 00' to 43° 00'

Longitude 72° 00' to 74° 40'.

The latitudes are chosen to cover both the Port of New York and the Hudson River to Troy, N.Y. The longitudes are chosen to include most of Long Island Sound on the east and the northern part of the New Jersey seacoast (Sandy Hook, Perth Amboy, south to Manasquan) on the west.

The greatest oil movement, about 130 million tons/year in this region, is in the Port of New York, which includes oil movement on the New Jersey side of the harbor as well. The

Hudson River from New York to Troy is the next largest sub-area of oil movement and spills. The third level of activity occurs along the northern shore of Long Island Sound (New Haven, New London, Bridgeport). It is of some interest to determine spill rates for these sub-areas, which are indicated by the dashed lines in Figure A-1.

#### Delaware Bay

Latitude  $38^{\circ} 30'$  to  $40^{\circ} 30'$

Longitude  $74^{\circ} 40'$  to  $75^{\circ} 45'$ .

This region encompasses all of Delaware Bay and the Delaware River up to Frenchtown, NJ, (about 18 miles north of Trenton, NJ). It also encompasses the ocean approaches to Delaware Bay, from the Cape May area of New Jersey to approximately the Maryland-Delaware border.

This region comprises both the large open-water body of Delaware Bay and the confined waters of the Delaware River from Wilmington DE to Trenton NJ. It is not possible to segregate the ACOE oil movement data into these two sub-regions; Delaware Bay traffic is aggregated with that from Philadelphia (south of Allegheny Avenue) and Wilmington in the ACOE tabulations.

#### Louisiana Coast

Latitude  $28^{\circ} 00'$  to  $30^{\circ} 30'$

Longitude  $88^{\circ} 20'$  to  $93^{\circ} 40'$ .

This encompasses all of the central part of the Gulf Coast, from just east of Mobile and Pascagoula, AL, almost to the Texas-Louisiana border on the west. It includes Lake Charles and the Calcasieu River and Lake, but not Port Arthur, Orange, Beaumont or the Sabine-Neches Waterways. It includes almost all of the drilling platforms offshore of Louisiana and Mississippi. To the north, it covers the Mississippi River up to and including Baton Rouge, LA.

The eastern, western, and northern boundaries of this region were selected so as to avoid cutting waterways for which data is tabulated as a whole by the ACOE. On the east, the Gulf

Intracoastal waterway is tabulated from Mobile AL to New Orleans LA. On the west, the Intracoastal Waterway from Lake Charles to Sabine is tabulated as a whole. The northern boundary, unfortunately, cuts off the northern end of the Atchafalaya River, but coincides with the New Orleans - Baton Rouge section of the Mississippi River, which carries heavy traffic and which is tabulated separately, as will be seen.

#### N. Texas Coast

Latitude 28° 00' to 30° 30'

Longitude 95° 30' to 96° 00'.

This region is adjacent to the Louisiana Coast Region defined above, going from approximately the Texas-Louisiana border to just south of the Matagorda ship channel, which is about 40 nautical miles southwest of Freeport, TX. The major oil movements in this region take place in the Sabine-Neches Waterway (Port Arthur, Sabine, Orange, Beaumont) and in the Galveston-Houston-Texas City area. The western boundary selected for this region presents a slight problem, for it is impossible to select a meridian to the west of Freeport TX and Houston TX which does not intersect the Galveston-Corpus Christi section of the Intracoastal Waterway. The limited amount of traffic on that waterway, however, assures that any inaccuracy introduced is minor.

### 3. EXPANSION OF THE SPILL DATA BASE

The purpose now is to establish a data base of spills over 10,000 gallons of oil and oil products in the four geographic regions of interest in the period 1974 through 1977. Several sources of spill data are available. The primary sources employed are the Pollution Incident Reporting System (PIRS) file and the National Response Center (NRC) files. Supporting data were also extracted from the Commercial Vessel Casualty File (CVCFF). All three data sources are maintained by the U.S. Coast Guard.

Although other data sources for spills in U.S. waters in the years 1974-77 are available,\* they were not systematically consulted because it was believed that the PIRS and NRC files contained the vast majority of spills of interest. The validity of that assumption will be discussed later.

#### 3.1 SELECTION CRITERIA

In addition to the geographic and temporal limits stated, two other selection criteria were employed. They are:

- (a) Spills of oil or oil products. These are to be classed as crude, heavy (including asphalt, creosote, road tar, as well as the common residual oils, #4, #5, and #6), and light (including gasoline, naphtha and diesel fuels)
- (b) Spills of 10,000 gallons or more. The quantity spilled (not the amount in the water) is referred to here. The value of 10,000 gallons was expected to yield a large enough data base to provide statistically significant results.

---

\* Among these sources one may mention (1) The Center for Short Lived Phenomenon, Cambridge MA, (2) Lloyd's Weekly Casualty Reports, (3) The Tanker Advisory Center, New York, NY.

No constraints were applied to the spill source in the data extraction phase. Thus spills from both transportation-related and non-transportation-related sources were extracted initially, as were both onshore and offshore sources. The extent to which spills from various sources can be related to different measures of exposure was determined after the data extraction phase. Neither were any constraints applied to the spill cause(s) or to jurisdiction (EPA vs USCG) in the extraction phase, for the same reason. Thus the intent was to obtain initially a list of all spills within the designated limits of time, location and material, that could later be related to available exposure measures.

### 3.2 POLLUTION INCIDENT REPORTING SYSTEM (PIRS) DATA

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act (FWPCA) Amendment of 1972 requires (Section 311 (b) (5)) that:

"Any person in charge of a vessel or of an onshore facility or an offshore facility shall, as soon as he has knowledge of any discharge of oil or a hazardous substance from such vessel or facility in violation of paragraph (3) of this subsection, immediately notify the appropriate agency of the United States Government of such discharge."

The discharges referred to in paragraph (3) are those of "oil or hazardous substances into or upon the navigable waters of the United States, adjoining shorelines, or into or upon the waters of the contiguous zone in harmful quantities as determined by the President...." In Executive Order 11735, August 3, 1973, the Coast Guard was designated as the "appropriate agency" to be notified.

The PIRS pre-dates the above statute, having been put into operation in the U.S. Coast Guard in December 1971.\* From that date it was required of Coast Guard personnel to report all spills that they observed or that they came to know about, the same requirement as was imposed in 1972 on non-Coast Guard personnel

---

\* See page 1 of Reference 10.

by the above Amendment to the FWPCA. Also, the Coast Guard is charged with enforcement of the 1972 Amendment, for all offending discharges in U.S. navigable waters, so that the PIRS includes information on penalty action as well as the spill itself. Thus, in theory, the PIRS covers all offending spills in the United States.

A facsimile of the PIRS coding sheet for a discharge is shown in Figure 3-1 (The two other coding forms, one for response and one for penalty action, are not shown). It should be noted that the water body code refers to the type of water body (one of 7 types allowed for inland and Great Lake spills, 11 types for coastal spills). The name of the water body is not recorded in PIRS. Similarly, vessel type and identification number are given, but the vessel name is not given. Ten sizes of tankships and ten sizes of barges are allowed for, plus seven other types of vessels.

The PIRS classification of sources (Reference 10, pages 26-28) served as the basis for the spill classification used in this report. As will be seen in the next section, oil movement and vessel trip data are available (Reference 9) for tankships and barges. Hence spills involving tankers and barges were segregated. Spills involving dockside oil facilities, such as transfer spills, were also extracted separately from the spill data, since they are directly related to waterborne oil movement. The remaining spills are not directly related to oil movement and were classified as (1) those connected with offshore drilling, and (2) onshore facility spills. The complete classification list, with corresponding PIRS source code numbers from Reference 10, is given in Table 3-1.

When the PIRS data tape was examined for spills over 10,000 gallons it was found to contain many records for which the latitude and longitude, or river and mile, at which the spill occurred were not recorded. These incidents all bear dates prior to



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION U. S. COAST GUARD CG-4690 (Rev. 12-75)		POLLUTION INCIDENT REPORTING SYSTEM (PIRS) (DISCHARGE)		INPUT TO PIRS PRE-EDIT 12210M	
NOTE: 1. A - Alpha, N - Numeric (zero-fill), A/N - Alpha/Numeric 2. Columns 1 thru 16 same for both cards.					
FIELD		CARD COLUMN	DATA		
RECORD ID	District	1-2 (N)			
	Sequence Number	3-7 (N)			
	Date of	8 - 13 (N)	Yr.	Month	Day
	Transaction Code	14 - 16 (A)	ADD/COR/DEL		
DISCHARGE	Card Number	17 (N)	1		
	Time of Occurrence	21 - 23 (N)	Day of Week	Hour of Day	
	Location	24 - 33 (A/N)			
	State	34-35 (A)			
	Water Body	36 - 38 (N)			
	Source	39 - 41 (A/N)			
	Source Identifier	42 - 49 (N)			
	Cause	51-52 (A)			
	Operation	54-55 (N)			
	Material	56 - 59 (N)			
	Quantity	60 - 67 (A/N)			
	Affected Resources	69 - 74 (A/N)			
	Report Period Date	75 - 80 (N)	Yr.	Month	Day
	Card Number	17 (N)	2		
	Wind Speed/Direction	21 - 25 (N)	Knots	° True	
Sea Hgt./Swell Direction	26 - 30 (N)	Feet	° True		
Current Speed/Direction	31 - 35 (N)	Knots	° True		
Notifier	39-41 (A/N)				
Anticipated Response	42 (N)				
OPFAC Number	44 - 53 (A/N)				
Report Period Date	75 - 80 (N)	Yr.	Month	Day	

PREVIOUS EDITION IS OBSOLETE

FIGURE 3-1. PIRS DATA FORM (Page 1)

TABLE 3-1. SPILL CLASSIFICATION

SPILL SOURCE	PIRS CODE NUMBER
<u>Vessel Spills</u>	
Tankships	010 through 019
Tank Barges	030 through 039
Other Vessels	000, 050 through 058
<u>Marine Facility*</u>	
<u>Offshore</u>	
Production	506
Pipelines	402
<u>Onshore</u>	
Pipelines	400, 401
Other Transportation	200 through 399
Non-Transportation	500 through 504, 507 and 508
Other	900, 999

\*Spills from these sources include so-called "transfer spills".

January 1976: 95 of the 316 spills over 10,000 gallons from January 1974 through January 1976 have no latitude and longitude or river and mile. These records, however, have the state in which the spill occurred, and on that basis it was possible to narrow down to 38 the number that could have occurred in any of the regions of interest. Of these, only 3 could be classified with any assurance into a region, since they were recorded as coastal spills. The remaining 35 spills bore an inland water body type code, and could not be definitely classified as in a region.

Table 3-2 shows a breakdown of the 555 PIRS records for spills of 10,000 gallons or more, from 1974 through 1977. One hundred forty-seven, or about 26%, are recorded to have occurred in these regions; 373, or 67%, are recorded as outside any of the regions; and 35, or about 6%, are possibly within the regions of interest. Of these 35 possible regional spills, the preponderance is in Texas for some unknown reason. The exact distribution of the 35 spills by state is:

Connecticut	0
New York	0
New Jersey	2
Pennsylvania	2
Louisiana	4
Texas	27.

All 35 spills occurred in 1974 or 1975.

### 3.3 NATIONAL RESPONSE CENTER (NRC) CENTRAL REPORTING FACILITY DATA

The National Response Center was established at USCG Headquarters and began functioning in August 1974, in accordance with the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (Title 40 CFR, Part 1510). Until Jan. 1, 1977 the NRC was one of four USCG elements to which a spill could be

TABLE 3-2. ANALYSIS OF PIRS SPILL RECORDS  
JANUARY 1974 - DECEMBER 1977

Number of PIRS records, oil spills of 10,000 gallons or more .....	<u>555</u>
Latitude and Longitude specified .....	405
River and Mile specified .....	55
State only specified .....	<u>95</u>
	555
Categorized to one of four regions on basis of latitude and longitude, or river and mile	
New York Region .....	51
Delaware Bay Region .....	19
Louisiana Coast Region .....	45
North Texas Region .....	29
Probably within one of the four regions, on basis of state only and water body type .....	3
Possibly within one of the four regions, on basis of state only and water body type .....	35
Not in any of the four regions .....	<u>573</u>
	555

reported.\* From January 1, 1977 on it was required that all spills be reported to the NRC, if practical. Duties of the NRC include receiving, evaluating and disseminating reports of spills, and maintenance of case files on medium coastal and major inland pollution incidents. Thus a scan of the NRC files can be expected to yield spills of 10,000 gallons or more, based on the definitions of medium and major discharges. (See Reference 17, 1510.5 (2)). While reporting to the NRC did not become a requirement until January 1, 1977, it nevertheless was expected, from the nature and history of the NRC, that most spills over 10,000 gallons from August 1974 onward would be recorded in its files.

The NRC case files are not coded and must be scanned manually. This was done for all cases within the four regions from August 1974 through December 1977. The process yielded a total of 79 incidents of oil spills over 10,000 gallons. The primary data extracted for each spill were:

- Latitude and Longitude, or River and Mile
- Location Name and State
- Water Body Name
- Source Name, Type Code, and Identification Number
- Material Code (as in PIRS)
- Quantity Spilled
- Date and Time
- Cause and Factor Code (as in PIRS).

It was found that quantity discharged was not always stated in the NRC files. Often the quantity recovered was reported but no estimate given of the total quantity discharged or reaching the water. In such cases, unless the information could be extracted from the PIRS file, a nominal factor of 2.0 was

---

\*The others were (a) the pre-designated On-Scene-Coordinator, (b) the Officer-in-Charge of any Coast Guard unit in the vicinity of the discharge, and (c) the Commander of the Coast Guard District in which the spill occurs.

applied to the quantity recovered to estimate the quantity discharged. This process was followed also when the quantity reported discharged was less than the total quantity reported recovered.

The latitude and longitude of the spill, or the river mile, when not given in the PIRS or NRC reports, were obtained from an atlas, based on the described location. Hence some are approximate. Similarly, the source code, material code, and cause/factor code were assigned using the PIRS coding manual and the NRC narrative account whenever a PIRS record for the spill could not be identified.

#### 3.4 COMBINED PIRS AND NRC DATA - UNRECORDED SPILLS

The combined PIRS and NRC spills are listed in Appendix A. This listing also includes data from the Commercial Vessel Casualty File, the uses of which will be discussed in the next section. An analysis of the PIRS and NRC data by source and year is given for each region in Tables 3-3, 3-4, 3-5, and 3-6. The analysis for all four regions combined is given in Table 3-7. In all of these tables there is shown the number of spills in the PIRS files, in the NRC files, and in both files, in the form X/Y/Z.

The most striking feature of Table 3-7 is the relatively low fraction of all reported spills that appear both in the PIRS and NRC files. The number of distinct spills appearing in the two files is  $X + Y - Z$ , or  $146 + 76 - 46 = 176$ , as obtained from the total shown in Table 3-7. The number of spills that appear in both files, however, is only 46, giving an "overlap" of only 26%. Since NRC did not commence operation until August 1974, however, it does not contain many spills occurring prior to that month. Hence, only the period August 1974 through December 1977 should be considered in any estimate of recording overlap. When this is done, however, the result is still only 30%, as seen in Table 3-8.

TABLE 3-3. PIRS AND NRC SPILLS OVER 10,000 GALLONS, 1974-77

- NEW YORK -

	1974	1975	1976	1977	Total
<u>Vessels</u>					
Tankers	1/1/1	2/2/2	1/1/1	0/0/0	4/4/4
Barges	7/1/1	2/2/2	0/1/0	3/1/1	12/5/4
Other	2/0/0	0/0/0	1/0/0	1/0/0	4/0/0
<u>Marine Facilities</u>	3/1/1	1/0/0	1/0/0	3/0/0	8/1/1
<u>Offshore</u>					
Production	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0
Pipelines	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0
<u>Onshore</u>					
Pipelines	1/0/0	0/1/0	1/1/0	0/0/0	2/2/0
Other Transportation	1/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	2/1/1	3/1/1
Non-Transport	3/1/1	2/0/0	6/2/1	3/2/1	14/5/3
Other and Unknown	3/0/0	1/0/0	1/2/0	1/1/0	6/3/0
<u>Total</u>	21/4/4	8/5/4	11/7/2	13/5/3	53/21/13

LEGEND: PIRS/NRC/BOTH.

TABLE 5-4. PIRS AND NRC SPILLS OVER 10,000 GALLONS, 1974-71

- DELAWARE BAY -

	1974	1975	1976	1977	Total
<u>Vessels</u>					
Tankers	2/1/1	1/1/1	2/2/2	0/0/0	5/4/4
Barges	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0
Other	0/0/0	1/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	1/0/0
<u>Marine Facilities</u>	0/0/0	0/0/0	2/0/0	0/0/0	2/0/0
<u>Offshore</u>					
Production	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0
Pipelines	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0
<u>Onshore</u>					
Pipelines	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0
Other Transportation	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0
Non-Transport	2/0/0	3/2/0	2/1/0	1/0/0	8/3/0
Other	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	1/0/0	1/0/0
<u>Total</u>	4/1/1	5/3/1	6/3/2	2/0/0	17/7/4

LEGEND: PIRS/NRC/BOTH.



TABLE 3-5. PIRS AND NRC SPILLS OVER 10,000 GALLONS, 1974-77

## - LOUISIANA COAST -

	1974	1975	1976	1977	Total
<u>Vessels</u>					
Tankers	1/1/1	2/2/2	0/1/0	0/1/0	3/5/3
Barges	3/3/1	2/3/2	3/3/3	5/3/1	13/12/7
Other	1/0/0	0/0/0	2/0/0	1/0/0	4/0/0
<u>Marine Facilities</u>	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0
<u>Offshore</u>					
Production	1/1/0	1/1/1	6/2/2	0/0/0	8/4/3
Pipelines	0/1/0	1/0/0	1/1/1	1/1/1	3/3/2
<u>Onshore</u>					
Pipelines	2/0/0	2/1/1	1/1/0	1/1/0	6/3/1
Other Transportation	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0
Non-Transport	1/0/0	3/2/0	1/2/1	2/1/0	7/5/1
Other	1/1/1	0/1/0	0/0/0	2/0/0	3/2/1
<u>Total</u>	10/7/3	11/10/6	14/10/7	12/7/2	47/34/18

LEGEND: PIRS/NRC/BOTH.

TABLE 3-6. PIRS AND NRC SPILLS OVER 10,000 GALLONS, 1974-77

- NORTH TEXAS COAST -

	1974	1975	1976	1977	Total
<u>Vessels</u>					
Tankers	1/0/0	1/1/1	1/1/1	1/1/1	4/3/3
Barges	3/1/1	1/1/1	2/2/2	1/1/1	6/4/4
Other	0/0/0	0/0/0	1/0/0	1/0/0	2/0/0
<u>Marine Facilities</u>	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/1/0	1/1/1	1/2/1
<u>Offshore</u>					
Production	1/0/0	0/0/0	1/0/0	0/0/0	8/3/1
Pipelines	0/0/0	1/1/1	0/0/0	0/0/0	1/1/1
<u>Onshore</u>					
Pipelines	6/2/1	0/1/0	0/0/0	1/0/0	7/3/1
Other Transportation	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0
Non-Transport	1/1/1	2/0/0	1/0/0	1/0/0	5/1/1
Other	0/0/0	1/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	1/0/0
<u>Total</u>	12/4/3	6/4/3	5/3/2	6/3/3	29/14/11

LEGEND: PIRS/NRC/BOTH.

TABLE 3-7. PIRS AND NRC SPILLS OVER 10,000 GALLONS, 1974-77

- ALL FOUR REGIONS -

	1974	1975	1976	1977	Total
<u>Vessels</u>					
Tankers	5/3/3	6/6/6	4/5/4	1/2/1	16/16/14
Barges	13/5/3	5/6/5	5/6/5	9/5/3	31/21/15
Other	3/0/0	1/0/0	4/0/0	3/0/0	11/0/0
<u>Marine Facilities</u>	3/1/1	1/0/0	3/1/0	4/1/1	11/3/2
<u>Offshore</u>					
Production	2/1/0	1/1/1	6/2/2	0/0/0	9/4/3
Pipelines	0/1/0	2/1/1	1/1/1	1/1/1	4/4/3
<u>Onshore</u>					
Pipelines	9/2/1	2/3/1	2/2/0	2/1/0	16/8/2
Other Transportation	1/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	2/1/1	3/1/1
Non-Transport Facility	7/2/2	10/4/0	10/5/2	7/5/1	34/14/5
Other	4/1/1	2/1/0	1/2/0	4/1/0	11/5/1
<u>Total</u>	47/16/11	30/22/14	36/24/14	33/15/8	146/76/46

LEGEND: PIRS/NRC/BOTH.

TABLE 3-8. SPILLS RECORDED BY PIRS AND NRC

	By PIRS	By NRC	By Both	% Overlap
Aug. 74 - Dec. 74	15	12	8	42%
1975	30	22	14	37%
1976	36	24	14	30%
1977	33	15	8	20%
Net	X=	Y=	Z=	
Aug. 74 - Dec. 77	114	73	44	30%

Since only 30% of the reported spills appear in both files, one is led to inquire: How many spills occurred, but appeared in neither file? Surprisingly, it is possible to estimate how many spills were not recorded at all. In fact, the method for making such an estimate has long been used in estimating game population (Reference 18, p. 43) and demographic characteristics. It has also been employed by the Federal Aviation Administration (Reference 19) to estimate the actual number of near mid-air collisions (NMAC's) from two sets of pilot reports.

To apply this technique, it is necessary to assume that the spills listed in the PIRS or NRC records are selected at random from all spills over 10,000 gallons that occurred between August 1974 and December 1977. This assumption would not hold if certain types of spills were recorded by one source more consistently than other types. If, for example, vessel-related spills were not recorded by NRC with the same reliability as pipeline spills, then the estimation method would not be valid. It was not possible to ascertain, from interviews with the relevant USCG personnel, whether such a bias did indeed exist. Neither does examination of the data of Table 3-7 show any intelligible pattern. One might expect that the PIRS records, which are entered by the USCG personnel at the District level, would contain relatively more records of vessel, offshore and other marine spills than the NRC records, which are reported by all observers in the country. This, however, is not reflected in the data of Table 3-7, which show that vessel, offshore and other marine spills constitute 48% of the PIRS records and 52% of the NRC records.

Given the above assumption, however, one may estimate from Table 3-8 (see Appendix B) that the number  $N$  of spills that have actually occurred from Aug. 1974 to December 1977 in the four regions is:

$$\begin{aligned} N &= N \cdot Y / I \\ &= 114.73 / 44 \\ &= 189 \end{aligned}$$

The number of distinct spills recorded by the two sources, 144, is therefore about 73% of the number estimates to have actually occurred.

One may justifiably inquire as to the confidence that may be placed in the estimate of N. As discussed in Appendix B, the overlap  $\bar{I}$  is approximately normally distributed about  $XY/N$  with variance V:

$$V = X (N-X) Y (N-Y) / N^3$$

As different values of N are assumed, the distribution of the overlap  $\bar{I}$  varies, according to the following table:

Assumed Value of N	=	150	165	190	235	250
Expected Overlap $\bar{I}$	=	55.5	50.9	44.0	35.4	33.5
Variance V of Overlap	=	5.1	8.7	10.7	12.6	12.8
Probability of $\bar{I} \leq 44$	=	<.0001	.02	.50		
$\bar{I} \geq 44$				.50	.02	.002

From the last line of the above table it appears unlikely that N is less than 165 or more than 235. It should be reiterated that this N applies only to the period August 1974 through December 1977.

One also may inquire as to the effect of the assumption of independent reporting. While no formal mechanism exists for PIRS or NRC to obtain data from the other system, it is possible that informal communication existed between them during the time frame of interest. If this was so, however, the estimated total number of spills would be greater than 189, rather than less, for the data. This, also, is demonstrated in Appendix B.

In summary, one must conclude that at least 15%, and most likely 25% of all oil spills over 10,000 gallons in 1974-77 went unrecorded in either PIRS or NRC, in the four regions studied. If one considers only vessel and other marine spills, however,

the most likely estimate of unrecorded spills is 15% rather than 25%.

### 3.5 COMMERCIAL VESSEL CASUALTY FILE (CVCF)\*

The Commercial Vessel Casualty File is based on U.S. Coast Guard reports made on Forms CG-2692, CG-924E, and related reports. It encompasses all casualties to U.S. vessels, or to foreign vessels in U.S. waters, provided the casualty involved one or more of the following:

- a. Property damage in excess of \$1500
- b. Damage affecting the seaworthiness of the vessel
- c. Stranding or grounding
- d. Loss of life
- e. Injury producing at least 72 hours incapacity.

Oil leakage or spillage alone does not require the filing of a casualty report, unless the value of the oil or its damage exceeds \$1500. Moreover, the amount of oil spilled is not included in CG-2692 and is recorded in the computerized file only as: 0 = no significant data, 1 = light oil pollution, 2 = moderate oil pollution, 3 = heavy oil pollution. The narrative reports and Form CG-2692 give more specific data than the computerized file. It was found that the computer file was adequate only for a coarse screening, because it records the date only to the month, and location only to the nearest Maritime Position number,\*\* and the quantity of oil only approximately, as 0,1,2, or 3. Therefore it was necessary, in many cases, to examine the actual casualty file to determine whether an incident listed in the CVCF printout was distinct from a similar incident recorded in PIRS or NRC, and if so, how much oil was spilled. Even when this was done there remained some 25 cases

---

\* Referred to as the Merchant Vessel Casualty File (MVCF) in Reference 15.

\*\* These "Bowditch numbers" are a set of 5- digit numbers assigned to recognizable coastal points, usually from 2 to 20 miles apart. See H.O. Publication No. 9, American Practical Navigator, N. Bowditch, any recent edition.

in the four regions, for which the CVCF was the only information source (i.e., no PIRS or NRC data) and with only the 0,1,2,3 indicator of the amount of oil spilled. This indicator, therefore, was examined in some detail.

Comparison of the CVCF pollution indicator (0,1,2,3) with quantity spilled as recorded in PIRS and in the CVCF Investigating Officer's Report yielded the following breakdown:

CVCF INDICATOR		
= 1	= 2	= 3
(light pollution)	(moderate pollution)	(heavy pollution)
20,000 P	11,000 P	103,000 P
13,000 P	82,000 P	32,000 P
100 V	21,000 P	102,000 P
000 V	90,000 P	63,000 P
000 V	277,000 P	210,000 P
200 V	420,000 P	378,000 P
200 V	5,000 V	900 V
1,500 V	1,474 V	
126 V	500 V	
15 V	1,000 V	
84 V	84,000 P	
2 V	103,000 P	
0 V		
160,000 P	23,000 P	
200 V	840,000 P	
60 V	84,000 P	
0 V	16,800 P	
0 V		
420 V		

P = amount spilled, in gallons, recorded in PIRS file  
V = amount spilled, in gallons, shown in CVCF Investigating Officer's Report.



From this breakdown it appears that the amount recorded in the VCF Investigating Officer's Report is usually less than the amounts recorded in PIRS, for spills bearing the pollution indicator 1 or 2. Further, the VCF pollution indicator is not always consistent with itself. A spill described in the VCF case report #72375 as being approximately 1500 gallons bears an indicator of 1, (light pollution) while one described as approximately 900 gallons in case #51795 bears an indicator of 3, (heavy pollution). It should also be noted that many VCF reports did not attempt to estimate amount of pollution, referring the reader to the report of the OCMI or COTP cognizant of the spill.

Given the above uncertainties in quantity spilled, as indicated by the CVCF, the following compromise with accuracy was made: Spills for which the CVCF pollution indicator was the only information on quantity spilled were considered to be 10,000 gallons or more if the indicator was 2 or 3. This procedure, plus the Investigating Officer's estimates, yielded a total of 9 spills over and above the 144 recorded in PIRS or NRC for 1974-77: two in the New York region, one in Delaware Bay, five in Louisiana and one in North Texas.

#### 4. EXPOSURE VARIABLE DATA

The numbers of spills in the four regions cannot be compared meaningfully unless they are normalized to some measure of spill threat exposure in each region. A useful exposure variable must be related to the type of spill that it is intended to explain. For example, transfer spills might be related to the amount of oil loaded or unloaded; collisions and groundings might be related to the total vessel miles in a waterway or harbor; onshore spills might be related to the total oil entering and leaving a region. For each of the classes of spills shown in Table 3-1, candidate exposure variables were selected from the oil and vessel movement data available in the ACOE "Waterborne Commerce of the United States." (Reference 9) This publication is the most comprehensive data source available on U.S. oil movement. The selections possible are shown in Tables 4-1 and 4-2. A check mark indicates that the spill source on the left is possibly related to the oil or vessel movement type shown at the top. Table 4-1 shows possible oil movement types and Table 4-2 shows possible vessel movement types.

##### 4.1 OIL MOVEMENT AS AN EXPOSURE VARIABLE

It is seen in Table 4-1 that tanker spills might be related to all types of oil movement except local, and barge spills to all types of movement except foreign. When the various types of oil movement are broken down by vessel type, however, one finds the data of Table 4-3. The tonnage movement breakdown suggests that one may attempt to relate tanker spills to foreign and coastal movement, and to relate barge spills to internal and local movement. Alternately, one may attempt to relate all vessel spills to the total oil movement. The vessel trip breakdown, however, shows that most trips are made by tank barges, particularly in the Gulf coast ports. These possibilities will be explored further in the next section. It suffices to note at this point that it may be useful to segregate the oil movement

TABLE 4-1. SPILL SOURCES AND OIL MOVEMENT TYPES

Spill Source	Oil Movement Type			
	Foreign	Coastal	Internal	Local
<u>Vessels</u>				
Tankers	✓	✓	✓	
Barges		✓	✓	✓
Other				
<u>Marine Facilities</u>	✓	✓	✓	✓
<u>Offshore</u>				
Production				
Pipeline				
<u>Onshore</u>				
Pipelines	✓	✓	✓	✓
Other Transport	✓	✓	✓	✓
Non-Transport	✓	✓	✓	✓
Other	✓	✓	✓	✓

TABLE 4-2. SPILL SOURCES AND VESSEL MOVEMENT TYPES

<u>Spill Source</u>	VESSEL TRIPS BY				
	Self-Propelled			Non-Self Propelled	
	<u>Tankers</u>	<u>Dry Cargo</u>	<u>Others</u>	<u>Tankers</u>	<u>Dry Cargo</u>
<u>Vessels</u>					
Tankers	✓				
Barges				✓	
Other		✓	✓		
<u>Marine Facilities</u>	✓			✓	
<u>Offshore</u>					
Production					
Pipeline					
<u>Onshore</u>					
Pipelines					
Other Transport					
Non-Transport					
Other					

TABLE 4-3. ANALYSIS OF U.S. OIL MOVEMENT BY VESSEL TYPE

PERCENT BY TONNAGE MOVEMENT<sup>(1)</sup>

	<u>Tankers</u>	<u>Tank Barges</u>
Foreign	100	0
Coastal	89	11
Internal	2	98
Local	14	86

PERCENT BY VESSEL TRIPS<sup>(2)</sup>

	<u>Tankers</u>	<u>Tank Barges</u>
Atlantic Ports	39	61
Pacific Ports	27	73
<u>Gulf Ports</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>90</u>
Combined Ports	24	76

(1) Reference 20, Tables I-A and II-A.

(2) Reference 20, Appendix E.

data into two groups: foreign and coastal in one group and internal and local in the other.

Spills from onshore activity cannot be directly related to any one type of oil movement. Onshore pipeline spills, in particular, may not involve oil that appears in waterborne oil movement data at all. Onshore storage tank leaks, a common source of onshore spills, may involve only oil that has had land transport in its history, and that would involve only land transport in its future. Clearly, distinguishing such onshore spills from those of waterborne oil is not practical, since it requires investigation of the transport history of the spilled oil. The only practical possibility appears to be to relate all onshore spills in the region to the total waterborne movement in the region.

Transfer spills and other marine spills are logically related to the total amount of oil that is loaded or unloaded on vessels in the region of interest. This is measured by the total of foreign, coastal, internal and local tonnages excluding the "through" component of such movements. The "through" movement in a waterway is the tonnage that enters and leaves the waterway without being loaded or unloaded within the waterway. Fortunately, ACOE data list through tonnages separately within the foreign, coastal, and internal categories. (Local movements do not encompass any through traffic). Subtracting the through tonnages from the total movement should yield an exposure variable that may be related to transfer spills.

#### 4.2 VESSEL TRIPS AS AN EXPOSURE VARIABLE

As noted above, the ACOE oil tonnage data do not distinguish barge from tanker movements for each of the four regions of interest.\* However, the data do show tanker and tank barge trips by port or waterway, but not for separate commodities. If one assumes that all tankers carry oil, then the trip data may be used as a measure of tanker and tank barge activity by port or waterway. However, not all tankers carry oil, and an estimate is

\*Part 5 of the ACOE volumes does give barge tonnages by commodity for the country as a whole.

needed of what fraction do so, and how that fraction varies from region to region. A check of the PIRS liquid spills over 10,000 gallons involving tankers or tank barges from 1973 through 1977, shows that 5% of tanker spills and 18% of tank barge spills were liquids other than petroleum or its derivatives.\* (These percentages are unchanged when spills on the Mississippi-Ohio-Illinois River systems are excluded from the count). Hence it appears that 95% of tankship trips are connected with petroleum movement, while about 80% of tank barge trips are so connected. It is not possible to determine, from published data, how this percentage varies from region to region. It is apparent then that vessel trips can reasonably serve as an exposure variable for tanker spills but some unknown loss in accuracy occurs when applied to barge movements.

#### 4.5 TABULATIONS

Appendix C gives oil movement tonnages for the four regions of interest, extracted from the ACOE volumes. Within each region the data are broken down by year, by type of oil (heavy, light, crude), and by waterway. Through movements are noted separately.

Appendix D gives vessel trips for the four regions of interest, also extracted from the ACOE volumes. Within each region, the data are broken down by year, by type of vessel (tanker, barge, all vessel types), and by waterway.

The totals for the four regions are given in Tables 4-4, 4-5, and 4-6. The striking feature of Tables 4-4 and 4-6 is the strong rise in tonnage in the Louisiana and North Texas regions from 1974-77. Total tonnage increased by about 57% in these four years. Tanker trips, however, increased by only 56% and barge trips were virtually unchanged. Most of the tonnage increase can be traced to crude oil imports into Baton Rouge, Lake Charles, Port Arthur, Houston/Texas City, and Freeport. (See Appendix C)

---

\*The percentage for tank barges excludes intentional dumping of chemicals under permit.

TABLE 4-4. OIL MOVEMENT FOR FOUR COASTAL REGIONS, BY YEAR<sup>(1)</sup>

(MILLIONS OF SHORT TONS)

NEW YORK REGION	1974	1975	1976	1977	Total
Port of New York	138.8	129.4	137.5	145.9	551.7
Long Island Sound	26.6	26.3	28.0	24.7	105.7
<u>Hudson River</u>	<u>18.6</u>	<u>17.7</u>	<u>18.0</u>	<u>17.6</u>	<u>71.9</u>
Total NY Region	184.0	173.4	183.5	188.2	729.3
DELAWARE BAY, Total	105.5	96.8	106.1	103.0	413.4
LOUISIANA COAST, Total	195.8	222.9	263.2	330.1	1012.0
NORTH TEXAS, Total	161.8	156.7	189.4	228.7	736.6

(1) Extracted from Appendix C.



TABLE 4-5. OIL MOVEMENT FOR FOUR COASTAL REGIONS, BY CARRIAGE<sup>(1)</sup>

(MILLIONS OF SHORT TONS)

	<u>Receipts &amp; Shipments</u>		<u>Through</u>		<u>Total</u>
	Ocean- going	Inter- nal	Ocean -going	Inter -nal	
NEW YORK REGION					
Port of New York	366.0	185.7	0.0	0.0	551.7
Long Island Sound	100.8	4.9	0.0	0.0	105.7
<u>Hudson River</u>	<u>19.4</u>	<u>49.7</u>	<u>0.1</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>71.9</u>
Total, NY Region	486.2	240.3	0.1	2.6	729.5
DELAWARE BAY REGION					
Total	287.9	95.4	26.8	3.4	413.4
LOUISIANA COAST REGION					
Total	272.0	276.6	198.0	265.4	1012.0
NORTH TEXAS REGION					
Total	404.6	171.6	28.6	160.4	736.6

(1) Extracted from Appendix C.

TABLE 4-6. VESSEL TRIPS FOR FOUR COASTAL REGIONS, 1974-77<sup>(1)</sup>

(THOUSANDS OF VESSEL TRIPS)					
	1974	1975	1976	1977	Total
NEW YORK REGION					
Port of New York					
Tankers	74.2	63.8	60.0	51.8	249.8
Barges	93.6	85.7	84.3	78.5	342.1
All Vessels	793.5	675.9	616.0	518.2	2603.6
Long Island Sound					
Tankers	5.1	4.4	4.2	3.7	17.4
Barges	7.7	7.8	6.5	6.0	28.0
All Vessels	127.4	115.3	114.2	105.4	462.3
Hudson River					
Tankers	2.3	1.9	1.8	1.5	7.5
Barges	8.5	7.4	7.7	7.1	30.7
All Vessels	110.9	93.0	78.9	62.3	345.1
Total, NY Region					
Tankers	81.6	70.1	66.0	57.0	274.7
Barges	109.8	100.8	98.5	91.6	400.7
All Vessels	1031.7	884.1	809.2	685.9	3410.9

(1) Extracted from Appendix D.

TABLE 4-6. VESSEL TRIPS FOR FOUR COASTAL REGIONS, 1974-77  
(CONTINUED)

	(THOUSANDS OF VESSEL TRIPS)				
	1974	1975	1976	1977	Total
DELAWARE BAY REGION					
Tankers	5.1	4.5	4.5	4.1	18.2
Barges	16.5	13.5	14.3	12.5	56.8
All Vessels	118.8	119.6	94.9	87.2	420.5
LOUISIANA COAST REGION					
Tankers	7.5	8.4	8.9	9.7	34.5
Barges	171.5	182.6	177.4	183.1	714.6
All Vessels	565.0	799.9	838.8	896.6	3100.3
NORTH TEXAS REGION					
Tankers	8.3	7.9	8.8	8.9	33.9
Barges	110.5	102.3	109.2	106.5	428.5
All Vessels	275.7	258.6	291.6	292.1	1118.1

## 5. SPILL RATES

The spill data and exposure data developed in the preceding sections will be combined here to yield spill rate estimates for the four regions. First, a set of estimates will be developed using tonnage of oil movement as the exposure variable, and then a set will be developed using vessel trips as the exposure variable. In both cases the spill rate estimates will be for spills of oil and oil products of 10,000 gallons or more in the four regions and in 1974-1977, derived by the method selected in Appendix E.

### 5.1 SPILLS PER MILLION TONS

The gross spill rates for the four regions, counting all spill sources and oil movements, are shown in Table 5-1. It appears that all regions have spill rates in the range of .04 to .07 spills per million tons except the Hudson River subsection of the New York region. The statistical significance of the observed spill rate in the Hudson River area can be tested by the method described in Appendix F. The normal approximation described there indicates that the odds against the Hudson River having the same spill rate as the remainder of the four regions are about 10,000,000,000 to 1, based on the data of Table 5-1.

It is clear then, that either the spill rate in the Hudson River is significantly different from that in the remainder of the regions, or that the Hudson River data (either spills or oil movement) are in error. This question will be treated in Section 5.5. First, it is appropriate to exclude the Hudson River data and to inquire whether any of the other regions or subregions show significant deviations from the remainder.

Table 5-2 summarizes the results of significance testing on the data for the four regions, excluding the Hudson River. The normal approximation and test procedure outlined in Appendix F were used once again. It is clear from the last column of Table 5-2 that none of the separate observations is very unlikely, given

TABLE 3-1. OVERALL SPILL RATES, 1974-77  
(SPILLS PER MILLION TONS)

	All Oil Spills (1) 1974-77	Waterborne Oil Movement (2) 1974-77	Spills per Million Tons Movement
NEW YORK			
Port of NY	38	551.7	.069
LI Sound	6	105.7	.057
Hudson River	19	71.9	.264
DELAWARE BAY	22	415.4	.055
LOUISIANA COAST	68	1012.0	.067
NORTH TEXAS	<u>34</u>	<u>736.6</u>	<u>.046</u>
	187	2891.5	.065

(1) Includes spills from all sources, as recorded in NRC, PIRS or VCF. See Appendix A.

(2) Millions of tons. See Table 4-4 or 4-5.

TABLE 5-2. SIGNIFICANCE TEST RESULTS<sup>(1)</sup> FOR ALL SPILLS IN THE FOUR REGIONS,  
EXCLUDING THE HUDSON RIVER

Region or Subregion	Oil Movement <sup>(4)</sup>	Expected Spills <sup>(2)</sup>	Expected Variance	Probability of Observed Spills <sup>(3)</sup>
Port of NY	551.7	32.9	26.3	0.30
LI Sound	105.7	6.3	6.0	0.91
Delaware Bay	413.4	24.6	20.9	0.44
Louisiana Coast	1012.0	60.3	38.4	0.20
N. Texas Coast	736.6	43.9	32.2	0.08
Total	2819.4	168.00	--	--

(1) Based on tests described in Appendix F.

(2) Assumes a total of 168 spills for 1974-77 in all regions, and the oil movement of column 1.

(3) Probability of all observations that deviate from the expected number of spills by as much as or more than does the actual observation, Table 5-1.

(4) Millions of tons, in the years 1974-77.

the total of 16<sup>7</sup> spills and the hypothesis that all regional spill rates are equal. The only possible exception is North Texas, which shows a .08 probability for the actually observed number of spills.

In assessing the significance of the North Texas spill rate, it should be recalled that an inordinate number of spills of unknown location (i.e., no latitude and longitude or river and mile) were located in Texas in 1974-77. As pointed out in Section 3.2, there were a total of 27 spills of 10,000 gallons or more in the PIRS file for which the location is given only as in the state of Texas. Although all 27 spills are classified by PIRS as inland, it is possible that a large fraction of them occurred in the North Texas region as defined in this report, i.e., below 30°30' latitude and east at 96°00'. The preponderance of Texas refineries are located in this area. If only one third fell into that region, for example, then the observed number of spills would be 43 instead of 34, and the probability would be .97 instead of 0.08. In fact it is necessary for only 6 of the 27 to fall within the region to make the probability of observation reach .50.

In contrast to the situation in the North Texas region, the other three regions have relatively few possible additions to their spill totals from the list of PIRS spills with only a state location. Louisiana shows 4 such spills, and Pennsylvania and New Jersey only 2 each. These spills cannot significantly alter the observed spill numbers in the Louisiana, Delaware Bay, or New York regions.

It is to be concluded, then, that no great significance can be attached to the .08 probability calculated for the observed North Texas spills. The outcome of significance testing on the gross spill rates for the four regions, then, is that only the Hudson River subregion shows a significant variation from the other regions.

## 5.2 VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS PER MILLION TONS

Since total waterborne oil movement should influence vessel-related spills more directly than all spills within a region, the regional vessel-related spill rates were calculated. These are

shown in Table 5-3. The first column shows spills from tankers, barges, and marine facilities such as loading and unloading areas. Offshore production and pipelines as well as all onshore spills are excluded (see Table 3-1). The second column shows total waterborne oil movement in millions of tons, as given in Table 5-1. The third column shows spills per million tons.

It is apparent once again that the Hudson River spill rate far exceeds those in the remainder of the region. The high overall spill rate, .264 spills/million tons, exhibited for the Hudson River in Table 5-1 is almost equalled by the vessel-related spill rate, .195 spills/million tons, for the Hudson River shown in Table 5-3. Therefore, pending its subsequent examination, the Hudson River will be excluded from the vessel-related spill data and the rates examined for the remainder.

Table 5-4 shows the results of significance tests on the vessel-related spill rates of all four regions, excluding the Hudson River. It is in the same format as Table 5-2, for all spill rates.

It is seen in Table 5-4, that in all regions, other than the Hudson River, the observed number of spills is not a rare event on the hypothesis that all regions have the same spill rate. Even the addition of say, 25% of the 27 non-specifically located spills in the state of Texas, to the North Texas Coast observation, would actually increase the probability of the observation from 0.38 to over 0.90. Hence it is not possible to reject the hypothesis of a single spill rate for vessel-related spills any more than for all spills, when the Hudson River is excluded.

### 5.3 VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS PER VESSEL TRIP

A third possibility that should be explored is that of a difference of spill rates employing vessel trips as the exposure variable. The most promising exposure variable is obviously trips by tankers and barges, since a very large fraction of them carry oil exclusively. These trips may be construed as the variable underlying the vessel-related oil spills. Table 5-5 shows the



TABLE 5-3. VESSEL-RELATED SPILL RATES, 1974-77  
(SPILLS PER MILLION TONS)

	<u>Vessel- Related Spills (1)</u>	<u>Waterborne Oil Movement (2)</u>	<u>Vessel-Related Spills per Million Tons Movement</u>
NEW YORK			
Port of NY	14	551.7	.025
LI Sound	5	105.7	.028
Hudson River	14	71.9	.195
DELAWARE BAY	9	413.4	.022
LOUISIANA COAST	32	1012.0	.032
NORTH TEXAS	<u>16</u>	<u>756.6</u>	<u>.022</u>
	88	2891.5	.030

(1) See Appendix A.

(2) Millions of short tons.

TABLE 5-4. SIGNIFICANCE TESTS<sup>(1)</sup> FOR VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS IN FOUR REGIONS,  
EXCLUDING THE HUDSON RIVER

Region or Subregion	Oil Movement <sup>(4)</sup>	Expected Spills <sup>(2)</sup>	Expected Variance	Probability of Observed Spills <sup>(3)</sup>
Port of NY	551.7	14.5	11.6	0.88
LI Sound	105.7	2.8	2.7	0.90
Delaware Bay	413.4	10.8	9.3	0.66
Louisiana Coast	1012.0	26.6	17.0	0.20
N. Texas Coast	736.6	19.3	14.3	0.38
	2819.4	74.00		

<sup>(1)</sup>Based on Appendix F.

<sup>(2)</sup>Assumes a total of 72 spills for 1974-77 in all regions, and the oil movement of column 1.

<sup>(3)</sup>Probability for all observations that deviate from the expected number of spills by as much as or more than does the actual observation, Table 5-3.

<sup>(4)</sup>Millions of tons, in the years 1974-77, as given in Appendix C.

TABLE 5-5. VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS PER TRIP, 1974-77

	<u>Vessel-Related Spills</u>	<u>Tanker and Barge Trips</u>	<u>Vessel-Related Spills per Thousand Trips</u>
NEW YORK			
Port of NY	14	591,825	0.0236
LI Sound	3	45,353	0.0661
Hudson River	14	38,369	0.3649
DELAWARE BAY	9	75,035	0.1200
LOUISIANA COAST	32	749,142	0.0427
NORTH TEXAS	16	462,393	0.0346
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	88	1,962,117	0.0448

rates for the four regions. The barge and tanker trip data are taken from Appendix D, while the vessel-related spills are the same as in Table 5-5.

Once again the spill rate for the Hudson River stands out well above all other regions or sub-regions. A significance test using the method of Appendix F shows the probability of observing 14 spills in the Hudson River, given a total of 86 spills and the indicated tanker and barge trips, is less than 1 in  $10^{10}$ . Therefore the Hudson River data will be reserved for later examination, and tests performed on the remaining data. The results are shown in Table 5-6.

From Table 5-6, it is seen that Delaware Bay shows a significantly higher number of vessel-related spills per tanker and barge trip than do the other regions. The data show a total of 9 such spills, while only 2.9 are expected on the basis of the region's vessel trips.

TABLE 5-6. SIGNIFICANCE TESTS<sup>(1)</sup> FOR VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS PER THOUSAND TANKER AND BARGE TRIPS, IN FOUR REGIONS, EXCLUDING THE HUDSON RIVER

Region or Subregion	Tanker and Barge Trips <sup>(2)</sup>	Expected Spills <sup>(3)</sup>	Expected Variance	Probability of Observed Spills <sup>(4)</sup>
Port of NY	591.8	22.8	15.8	.03
LI Sound	45.4	1.7	1.7	.32
Delaware Bay	75.0	2.9	2.8	.0004
Louisiana Coast	749.1	28.8	17.6	.45
N. Texas Coast	462.4	17.8	13.5	.62
	1923.7	74.00		

(1) Employing method of Appendix F.

(2) Thousands of trips, 1974-77, as given in Appendix D.

(3) Assumes a total of 72 spills, and vessel trips of preceding column.

(4) Probability of all observations that deviate from the expected number of spills by as much as or more than does the actual observation, Table 5-5.

Since Delaware Bay does not show a high spill rate when total oil tonnage is employed as the exposure variable, one is led to explore the total tonnage per barge or tanker trip for the four regions. This comparison is made in Table 5-7. The figures vary from a low of 932 tons per trip for the Port of New York subregion, to a high of 5512 tons per trip for Delaware Bay. (It will be noticed that the ratio for the Hudson River subregion is not substantially different from the average.) Delaware Bay, however, shows almost 4 times the average tons per trip, while none of the other regions or subregions deviates by more than 60% from the average.

TABLE 5-7. OIL TONNAGE PER TANKER OR BARGE TRIP IN FOUR REGIONS, 1974-77

<u>Region or Subregion</u>	<u>Oil Movement Tons/10<sup>6</sup></u>	<u>Tanker and Barge Trips/10<sup>3</sup></u>	<u>Tons per Trip</u>
NEW YORK			
Port of NY	551.7	591.8	932.2
LI Sound	105.7	45.4	2528.2
Hudson River	71.9	38.4	1872.4
DELAWARE BAY	413.4	75.0	5512.0
LOUISIANA COAST	1012.0	749.1	1350.9
N. TEXAS COAST	<u>736.6</u>	<u>462.4</u>	<u>1593.0</u>
	2891.3	1,962.1	1,473.7

It was estimated in Section 3 that about 80% of barge cargoes were oil, averaged over the U.S. Thus if, in a certain region, 100% of barge cargoes were oil, then its tons/barge trip figure would increase from the average by 25%. Similarly, if only 40% of barge cargoes were oil in a certain region, then its tons/barge trip figure would drop by 50%. The corresponding possible range of variation for tankers, which carry oil on 95% of their laden trips, on the average, is +5% and -58%. Therefore the +400%

variation from the average seen in Delaware Bay cannot be due to the mix of oil vs. other liquid cargoes, but can only be due to a substantially larger average tanker and barge cargo in Delaware Bay, or to a heavier percentage of tanker trips vs. barge trips in Delaware Bay. Neither supposition is borne out by an analysis of trips and drafts in Delaware Bay, compared to other port regions.\* It seems likely, then, that there are substantial inaccuracies in the barge and tanker trips data employed for Delaware Bay.

Another possibly significant deviation from the mean spill rate is observed in Table 5-6 under the Port of New York subregion. The observation probability here is seen to be .05, employing the test method of Appendix F with normal approximation. This deviation is significant, by a small margin, if a 95% significance level is employed, as has been done in previous tests. When so close a margin of significance is involved it is advisable to employ an additional test for corroboration. This may be done by hypothesizing a uniform spill rate of .0385 spills per thousand trips, obtained from the total number of vessel-related spills (74) and total number of barge and tanker trips (1,923,700) shown in Table 5-6. Thereupon, the expected number of vessel-related spills in the Port of New York is 22.8, based on the 591,800 tanker and barge trips for the sub-region shown in Table 5-6. The actually observed number of spills, however, is only 14, or about 8 spills less than expected. Assuming a Poisson distribution for the number of spills in the subregion leads to the conclusion that the probability is about .07 that an observation would differ from the expected 22.8 by as much as 9 spills, i.e., be as low as 14 or as high as 32. This approach, then, does not corroborate the results of the previous one, since it leads to only 93% level of significance instead of a 97% level. The deviation of spill rate in the Port of New York subregion, shown in Tables 5-5 and 5-6, then, can be considered of only marginal significance.

---

\*The average self-propelled tanker draft in 1975 was about 27.9 feet in the Delaware River, 24.4 feet in New York Lower Entrance Channels, and 28.5 feet in the Mississippi River between New Orleans and the Passes.

#### 5.4 OTHER SPILL RATES

Several possible spill rate calculations have been omitted because they offer less promise of insight into the spill process than the three treated above.

One spill rate calculation not performed is that of tanker spills (or barge spills) per tanker trip (or per barge trip). This has been omitted because the tanker-barge indicator in PIRS has been found to be unreliable, both in this and other studies (Reference 23). Considering the relatively small number of tanker and barge spills in the data in any one region, a rate calculation for tankers or for barges is subject to substantial errors if the barge/tanker breakout is not accurate. Any result would be suspect, and therefore no such calculations were made.

Another possible spill rate calculation is that of vessel-related spills per vessel trip, rather than per tanker and barge trip. This calculation was not made because trips of all vessels vary substantially from port to port and do not bear a fixed relation to tanker and barge trips. Expanding the vessel trips to include other than tankers would add many vessel trips (particularly ferries, and chemical or dry-cargo vessels) that bear no relation to oil spills. For this reason neither gross spills per vessel trip nor vessel-related spills per vessel trip were calculated.

Among other possible spill rates not here investigated are:

- crude oil spills per ton of crude movement
- heavy oil spills per ton of heavy oil movement
- light oil spills per ton of light oil movement
- spills per ton for individual years.

#### 5.5 ANALYSIS OF SPILL RATES

The calculations of the previous subsections show that the spill rates in the four selected regions have no significant deviations from their expected values with one major exception,

the Hudson River subregion. A minor exception also occurs in the vessel-related spills per tanker and barge trip in Delaware Bay.

The extraordinarily high spill rates calculated for the Hudson River in 1974-77 appear in three cases:

- o gross spills per million ton of oil movement
- o vessel-related spills per million tons of oil movement
- o vessel-related spills per thousand barge and tanker trips.

Before concluding that the Hudson River subregion does, indeed, have a higher than normal number of spills, two other explanations must be explored:

- a. Under-reporting of the exposure.
- b. Over-reporting of the spills.

#### 5.5.1 Under-reporting of Exposure

The two exposure variables involved are gross oil movement tonnage and tanker plus barge trips. The ACOE reporting of trips and of tons for domestic movements is done through the same mechanism, i.e., a single form. If both the trips and total tonnage were under-reported then this under-reporting probably occurred at the source, rather than in the compilation of statistics, because the spill rates derived from both variables are high. This possibility cannot be excluded because no alternate information source exists that may be used to verify the ACOE data.

A plot of Hudson River oil tonnage as reported by the ACOE by year is shown in Figure 5-1. If these data are under-reported, then the omissions must be consistent for each of the four years, particularly in the case of foreign and coastal light and internal heavy, which show little variation from year to year. Also, the crude movements are probably accurate because of the lack of refineries of any size in the Hudson valley. In short, if the spill rate anomalies for the Hudson River are due to under-reporting






FIGURE 5-1. HUDSON RIVER OIL MOVEMENT, 1974-77, ACOE DATA

of oil movement, then there would have to have been a systematic under-reporting at the data origination point over the years 1974-77. Although it cannot be excluded such a systematic error is considered unlikely.

### 5.5.2 Over-reporting of Spills

Over-reporting of spills could occur if fewer spills in the Hudson River subregion went unreported than in the other regions or subregions. The following tabulation (Table 5-8) shows the estimated unreported spill percentages, based on PIRS and NRC reports from August 1974 through December 1977. The Hudson River does, indeed, have a low percent of unrecorded spills. In obtaining these percentages, the PIRS spills that bore no specific location other than the state were allowed for. One-third of the inland spills located by state and occurring from August 1974 to December 1977, were assigned to the nearest region. This gave 6.0 additional spills to the North Texas Coast, 1.3 to the Louisiana Coast, 1.0 to Delaware Bay, and 0.3 to New York. Since none of these spills involved vessels or marine facilities, no assignments were made for vessel-related spills. The percent unreported was calculated as

$$\frac{X \cdot Y / Z - (X + Y - Z)}{X \cdot Y / Z} \cdot 100$$

where X is the total of PIRS spills, Y is the total of NRC spills, and Z is the number reported by both.

In the next calculation (Table 5-9) the reporting factor was applied to total reported spills, including VCF spills, to obtain the total estimated spills in all regions and subregions in 1974-1977. One third of the PIRS spills recorded by state only were assigned, as before, to the corresponding regions in order to obtain the estimate of total reported spills. This estimate was then multiplied by 100/percent reported to obtain the total spill estimate. The spill rates obtained from the estimated total spills (Table 5-10), however, still show that the Hudson River

TABLE 5-8. ESTIMATED PERCENT UNREPORTED SPILLS, AUGUST 1974 -  
DECEMBER 1977

	<u>PIRS (1)</u>	<u>PIRS State Only (2)</u>	<u>NRC</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>Unreported Percent (3)</u>
ALL SPILLS					
Port of NY	23	0.5	14	7	55%
LI Sound	3	0.0	2	1	33
Hudson River	13	0.0	4	4	0
Delware Bay	13	1.0	6	3	39
Louisiana Coast	42	1.5	32	18	26
N. Texas Coast	20	6.0	13	10	14
VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS					
Port of NY	9	0.0	5	3	27%
LI Sound	1	0.0	1	1	0
Hudson River	11	0.0	4	4	0
Delaware Bay	6	0.0	3	3	0
Louisiana Coast	18	0.0	16	10	17
N. Texas Coast	10	0.0	8	7	4

- (1) PIRS spills with specific location in the region from Appendix A.
- (2) PIRS spills without specific location, allocated 1/3 to adjacent region.
- (3) Estimated unreported spills as percent of total of reported and unreported.

TABLE 5-9. TOTAL ESTIMATED SPILLS, ALL REGIONS, 1974-77

	<u>PIRS and NRC(1)</u>	<u>VCF only</u>	<u>PIRS, State only</u>	<u>Total Reported</u>	<u>Total Estimated</u>
ALL SPILLS					
Port of NY	36	2	0.3	38.3	58.9
LI Sound	6	0	0.0	6.0	9.0
Hudson River	19	0	0.0	19.0	19.0
Delaware Bay	21	1	1.0	23.0	37.7
Louisiana Coast	63	3	1.3	69.3	93.6
N. Texas Coast	32	2	9.0	43.0	50.0
VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS					
Port of NY	12	2	0.0	14.0	19.2
LI Sound	3	0	0.0	3.0	3.0
Hudson River	14	0	0.0	14.0	14.0
Delaware Bay	8	1	0.0	9.0	9.0
Louisiana Coast	27	3	0.0	32.0	38.6
N. Texas Coast	14	2	0.0	16.0	16.7

(1) See Tables 3-3, 3-4, 3-5, and 3-6.

TABLE 5-10: TOTAL ESTIMATED SPILL RATES, ALL REGIONS, 1974-77

	<u>Estimated Spills</u>	<u>Exposure</u>	<u>Spill Rate</u>
SPILLS PER MILLION TONS			
Port of NY	58.9	551.7	0.107
LI Sound	9.0	105.7	0.085
Hudson River	19.0	71.9	0.264
Delaware Bay	37.1	413.4	0.090
Louisiana Coast	93.6	1012.0	0.092
N. Texas Coast	<u>50.0</u>	<u>736.6</u>	<u>0.068</u>
	267.6	2891.3	0.093

## VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS PER MILLION TONS

Port of NY	19.2	551.7	0.035
LI Sound	3.0	105.7	0.028
Hudson River	14.0	71.9	0.195
Delaware Bay	9.0	413.4	0.022
Louisiana Coast	38.6	1012.0	0.038
N. Texas Coast	<u>16.7</u>	<u>736.6</u>	<u>0.023</u>
	100.5	2891.3	0.035

VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS PER  $10^3$  TANKER AND BARGE TRIPS

Port of NY	19.2	591.0	0.032
LI Sound	3.0	45.4	0.066
Hudson River	14.0	38.4	0.365
Delaware Bay	9.0	75.0	0.120
Louisiana Coast	38.6	749.1	0.052
N. Texas Coast	<u>16.7</u>	<u>462.4</u>	<u>0.036</u>
	100.5	1962.1	0.051

has much higher spill rates than the other regions. Moreover, it appears that the North Texas Coast shows noticeably lower spill rates.

The significance of the spill rates of Table 5-10 is calculated in Table 5-11. The following results emerge:

- a. The Hudson River has a significantly higher spill rate than other regions or sub-regions, even when unrecorded spills are allowed for. The significance levels for all three spill rates are above 99.9%.
- b. The North Texas Coast shows a probability of .01 for the estimated spills in that region. This estimate (50 spills), however, includes a somewhat arbitrary assignment of one third of the PIRS spills located only by state.
- c. Delaware Bay shows significantly more vessel-related spills than other regions, based on tanker and barge trips. But for the reasons outlined in 5.3.1, the Delaware Bay trip data for barges and tankers probably explain this phenomenon.

Of the three anomalies above, only that of the Hudson River indicates without doubt an aberration in spills per million tons of oil movement or per thousand tanker and barge trips. Accordingly, the causes of these high spill rates will be analyzed next.

## 5.6 HUDSON RIVER SPILLS

Since neither under-reporting of exposure nor over-reporting of spills is a likely explanation of the high spill rate for the Hudson River, one is led to analyze the spills themselves. The breakdown of Hudson River spills over 10,000 gallons from 1974 to 1977, as extracted from Appendix A, is shown in Table 5-12.

It appears that groundings and marine facilities account for an inordinate percentage of spills in the Hudson River. Accordingly, a comparison of rates for groundings, collisions (including

TABLE 5-11. SIGNIFICANCE TESTS FOR TOTAL ESTIMATED SPILLS, ALL REGIONS, 1974-77

	<u>Estimated Spills</u>	<u>Exposure</u>	<u>Expected Spills</u>	<u>Expected Variance</u>	<u>Probability of Estimated</u>
SPILLS PER MILLION TONS					
Port of NY	58.9	551.7	51.1	41.3	.22
LI Sound	9.0	105.7	9.8	9.4	.79
Hudson River	19.0	71.9	6.7	6.5	.0000
Delaware Bay	37.1	413.4	38.3	32.8	.83
Louisiana Coast	93.6	1012.0	93.6	60.9	.99
N. Texas Coast	50.0	736.6	68.2	50.8	.01
	267.6	2891.3			
VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS PER MILLION TONS					
Port of NY	19.2	551.7	19.2	15.5	.99
LI Sound	3.0	105.7	3.6	3.5	.40
Hudson River	14.0	71.9	2.5	2.4	.0000
Delaware Bay	9.0	413.4	14.4	12.3	.12
Louisiana Coast	38.6	1012.0	35.2	22.9	.48
N. Texas Coast	16.7	736.6	25.6	19.1	.04
	100.5	2891.3			
VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS PER 10 <sup>3</sup> TANKER AND BARGE TRIPS					
Port of NY	19.2	591.0	30.3	21.2	.02
LI Sound	3.0	45.4	2.3	2.3	.65
Hudson River	14.0	38.4	2.0	1.9	.000
Delaware Bay	9.0	75.0	3.8	3.7	.007
Louisiana Coast	38.6	749.1	38.4	23.7	.97
N. Texas Coast	16.7	462.4	23.7	18.1	.10
	100.5	1962.1			

TABLE 5-12. ANALYSIS OF HUDSON RIVER SPILLS, <sup>(1)</sup>  
1974-1977

	1974	1975	1976	1977	Total
Groundings	4	1	0	1	6
Collisions*	0	1	0	0	1
Weather	0	0	0	1	1
Marine facilities	2	1	1	2	6
Onshore facilities	2	1	0	0	3
Miscellaneous	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
	8	3	1	5	19

<sup>(1)</sup> See Appendix A for list of spills.

\*Includes rammings.

rammings) and marine facility spills was made between all regions and the Hudson River. The results are summarized in Table 5-13, given as absolute number of spills in 74-77/spills per million tons in 74-77.

The six groundings shown in Table 5-13 for the Hudson River subregion are significantly higher than can be expected on the basis of the .006 groundings/million tons shown in that table for all regions together. The probability for six groundings in the Hudson River, given the average rate for all regions, is well under 1 in  $10^{10}$ . Similarly, the probability of six marine facility spills in the Hudson River subregion is also under 1 in  $10^{10}$ , given the average rate for all regions. These significance levels leave little doubt that there was a significantly higher rate of groundings and marine facility spills in the Hudson River subregion than in the other regions.



TABLE 5-13. COMPARISON OF GROUNDINGS, COLLISIONS AND MARINE FACILITY SPILLS IN HUDSON RIVER WITH OTHER REGIONS<sup>(1)</sup>

	<u>Groundings</u>	<u>Collisions</u>	<u>Marine Facilities</u>
Hudson River	6/.083	1/.014	6/.083
New York, exclusive of Hudson River	7/.011	3/.006	2/.003
Delaware Bay	1/.002	3/.007	2/.003
Louisiana Coast	4/.004	18/.017	0/.000
N. Texas Coast	<u>0/.004</u>	<u>7/.009</u>	<u>2/.003</u>
Total	18/.006	32/.011	12/.004

<sup>(1)</sup> The first number given is the number of spills, as extracted from Appendix A, and the second number gives the spills, per million tons of oil movement, 1974-77.

#### Groundings

The Commercial Vessel Casualty File was reviewed for groundings and other vessel casualties occurring in the Hudson River from 1974 through 1977, in order to determine the principal factors in these incidents. A synopsis of the eight casualties, taken from the Third District Marine Safety Office reports follows:

- a. Barge HYGRADE NO. 32, grounding at the Maue Oil Terminal, Ossining, January 11, 1974. "The proximate cause of the casualty was that heavy ice conditions delayed the barge's arrival at the terminal and subsequent discharging, so that at 0130, the barge's draught exceeded the depth of the water at the terminal due to the falling tide, thus resulting in the barge sitting on the bottom and puncturing one of the cargo tanks."
- b. Barge HYGRADE NO. 2, grounding off Magdalen Island, on July 19, 1974. The proximate cause of the casualty was an error in judgment on the part of the mate on watch, in that he relied

heavily on the use of radar as his means of navigation in heavy rain and fog, which resulted in straying out of the channel and grounding.

- c. Barge B NO. 75, grounded on Diamond Reef, New Hamburg, November 15, 1974. "The proximate cause of the casualty was negligence on the part of the mate on watch in that he failed to allow sufficient distance between his tow and Diamond Reef Lighted Buoy LLN 1889."
- d. Barge NEW LONDON, grounding near Con Hook Island, on February 5, 1974. "At approximately 0130, as the operator was unable to ascertain his position using radar, and searchlight due to the icing over the shoreline, icing over of navigational aids, and snow storm conditions, the tow went inside of the location of Buoy #21 (LLNR 1870) and touched bottom."
- e. Tanker COLORADO, striking of unknown underwater object near Athens, March 29, 1975. Hole in Number 2 Port Tank noticed after reaching Mobile, AL.
- f. Barge DELAWARE, struck Tappan Zee Bridge, on December 31, 1975. The tug barge struck the west pier of the west pass at about 0705 while under tow. Visibility was reduced to less than one-quarter mile by fog.
- g. Barge ETHYL H. grounded and sunk about 500 yards south of Con Hook, on February 4, 1977. "The proximate cause of the casualty was a failure on the part of the operator of the MV MCALLISTER BROS. to accurately ascertain his position in the river with respect to the charted rock." Because the radar had been showing a great deal of ice return and the visibility was good, the operator was not using the radar.
- h. Barge B.F.T. NO. 50, ice damage near Stuyvesant on January 11, 1977. "The proximate cause of the casualty was extreme cold and ice conditions in the Hudson River which resulted in the cracking of the hull of the T/B B.F.T. NO. 50. Ice in the Hudson River in this area ranged from 1.5 to 2.5 ft."

The major factors that appear from these incidents are that

(1) They predominantly involve barges rather than tankers. The proportion of barge incidents (7 out of 8) is not surprising, since about 80% of tank vessel trips in the Hudson are by barges. (See Appendix D).

(2) Weather was a factor in six of the eight incidents. It may be described as the major factor in two of the incidents (1., 6.) and appears to have been the only factor in two others (4. and 8.). The other major factor was piloting error. A breakdown (somewhat subjective) follows:

Incident #	Weather	Piloting	Other
1	✓		✓
2	✓	✓	
3		✓	
4	✓		
5			✓
6	✓	✓	
7	✓	✓	
8	✓		

#### Marine Facility

##### Spills

The six marine facility spills in the Hudson River subregion could not be investigated in any detail. None of these spills involved casualties, and hence had no casualty report; only one was recorded in the NRC files. The only information obtained for the remaining five was that of the PIRS files. The PIRS data contain no narrative report. The PIRS spill source and cause/factor codes, however, were as follows;

<u>Incident</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Cause/Factor</u>
1	101	Tank overflow/Improper valve operation
2	101	Natural or chronic phenomenon/Leaching from saturated ground
3	101	Valve Failure/PE-overpressurization
4	101	Tank rupture or leak/PE-overpressurization.
5	101	Improper equipment handling or operation/Improper valve operation
6	101	Tank overflow/Improper valve operation.

The 101 source code indicates onshore bulk cargo transfer at a marine facility. Four of the six incidents occurred in port or harbor areas; one occurred in a river or channel or other restricted navigable waterway; and one occurred on a beach or shore adjoining a navigable waterway or tributary to navigable water.

The 8-digit source identifiers associated with the above incidents indicate that only three of the spills (1, 4 and 6) occurred during a transfer operation. It is not recorded whether a vessel was involved in the transfers. It may be conjectured that such was the case in spills 1 and 6, but probably not in 4.

Unlike the vessel incidents, it is difficult to select a predominant cause or pattern to the marine facility incidents. If any single cause is prevalent it is that of improper valve operation, which was cited as a factor in three of the six cases, and in both (possibly) vessel-related cases.

## 6. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The results of this investigation have been developed from a data base of about 200 spills over 10,000 gallons in the period January 1974 through December 1977, (Appendix A). The data were extracted from the Pollution Incident Reporting System (PIRS), the National Response Center (NRC) files, and the Commercial Vessel Casualty File (VCF). In putting together this data base and in analyzing it, the following major results emerged:

- a. Some spills are recorded in PIRS but not NRC, and vice-versa. From this, and certain assumptions on sampling, (Section 3) it is estimated that at least 13% and probably about 23% of all spills in 1974-77 went unrecorded by either PIRS or NRC. The percentages for vessel-related spills are about half of these. Pooling the PIRS and NRC data recording mechanisms would not increase the percent of spills recorded and would make it more difficult to estimate that percentage.
- b. All four regions studied (New York, Delaware Bay, Louisiana Coast, North Texas Coast) had approximately the same number of spills per million tons of oil movement, with the exception of the Hudson River subregion of New York.
- c. All four regions exhibited similar numbers of vessel-related spills per million tons of oil movement, with the exception of the Hudson River subregion.
- d. When vessel-related spills per thousand tanker and barge trips were computed, it was found that only Delaware Bay and the Hudson River subregion have significantly different spill rates from the other regions. There is reason to believe, however, that the vessel trip data employed for Delaware Bay have substantial inaccuracies.

- e. An apparently low spill rate for the North Texas Coast region can not be attributed any statistical significance because of the large number (27) of spills recorded in PIRS only by state (Texas, in this case), many of which could have occurred in the North Texas Coast region.
- f. The high spill rates, of all three types tested, shown by the Hudson River subregion cannot be easily explained by either under-reporting of spills in the other regions (in so far as that could be estimated) or by under-reporting of the exposure variables.
- g. The high spill rates in the Hudson River are largely due to (1) groundings of barges and (2) marine facility spills. The groundings and other vessel casualties were traced primarily to weather conditions (ice and fog) but no explanation could be found for the marine facility spills, except (perhaps) faulty valve operation.

APPENDIX A  
OIL SPILLS OF 10,000 GALLONS OR MORE IN FOUR COASTAL REGIONS OF  
THE UNITED STATES 1974-1977



FIGURE A-1. GREATER NEW YORK AND DELAWARE BAY REGIONS




FIGURE A-2. LOUISIANA COAST AND NORTH TEXAS COAST REGIONS



OIL SPILLS OF 10000 GALLONS OR MORE  
IN FOUR U S COASTAL REGIONS  
1974 THROUGH 1977

COL 1 TWO DIGITS EACH FOR YEAR, MONTH, DAY, HOUR FOLLOWED BY ONE DIGIT TO  
INDICATE MULTIPLE SIMULTANEOUS SPILLS AND ONE DIGIT TO INDICATE CARD  
NUMBER 1 OR 2.  
COL 2 LATITUDE AND LONGITUDE OR RIVER AND MILE, AS PER PIRS CODING  
MANUAL, CG-450, FEB 1976.  
COL 3 WATER BODY NAME, WHEN AVAILABLE.  
COL 4 NEAREST CITY, TOWN OR GEOGRAPHIC FEATURE.  
COL 5-7 CASE NUMBERS.

COL 1	COL 2	COL 3	COL 4	COL 5	COL 6	COL 7
DATE/TIME	LOCATION	WATER BODY	CITY/STATE	PIRS	NRC	VCF
NEW YORK REGION-1						
1974-1						
7401041301	L422507347	HUDSON RIVER	MILL CREEK NY	0300018		
7401110101	L410907352	HUDSON RIVER	OSSINING NY	0300034		42310
7401190601	L404707356	EAST RIVER	NEW YORK CTY NY	0300075		41877
7401231001	L410207402	INLAND WATERWAY	MONTVALE NJ	0300098		
7402030101	L412007358	HUDSON RIVER C-HK	HIGHLAND FLS NY	0300147		42763
7402202401	L413107203	LONG ISLAND SOUND	NEW LONDON CT	0300207		
7403111901	L403207415	ARTHUR KILL	PERTH AMBOY NJ	0300281		
7403251601	L404307408	NEWARK BAY	NEWARK PORT NJ	0300326		
7405052101	L403907407	KILL VAN KULL	BAYONNE NJ	0300539		
7405061301	L403907410	NEWARK BAY	STATEN IS NY	0300537		42824
7407011401	L403107414	PERTH AMBOY	TOTTENVILLE NY	0300839		
7407141901	L410007305	LONG ISLAND SOUND	PORT JEFFRSN NY	0300893		
7407190101	L420207356	HUDSON RIVER	MAGDALEN ISL NY	0300921		50361
7407310801	L423507346	HUDSON RIVER	GLENMOUNT NY	0300986	3-75	
7408041601	L403407353	ROCKAWAY INLET	FORT TILDEN NY	0301012		
7408211201	L423707345	HUDSON RIVER	ALBANY NY	0301110		
7410050901	L404707359	HUDSON RIVER	MANHATTANNYC NY	0301285		
7410060101	L411807255	CONNECTICUT RIVER	NEW HAVEN CT	0301289	114-75	52110

741132301	L413507357	HUDSON RIVER	NEW HAMBURG	NY	0301437	179-75	51049
7412091101	L403007430	RARITAN RIVER	HIGHLAND PRK	NJ	0301633		
7412301501	L404407406	NEWARK BAY	JERSEY CITY	NJ	0301626	241-75	
1975-1							
7501070401	L404407356	NASSAU R NEWTONCR	LICV QUEENS	NY	0300026		
7501102301	L423707346	ISLAND CR HUDSONR	ALBANY	NY	0300043		
7503141001	L424507344	HUDSON RIVER	ALBANY	NY	0300300		
7503290901	L403707404	VARRAZANO NS HDSN	STATEN IS NY	NY	0300366	342-75	52859
7503291801	L423807344	HUDSON RIVER	ALBANY	NY	0300370	343-75	
7504090701	L424307342	HUDSON RIVER	ALBANY	NY	0300409		
7510071901	L404807354	EAST RIVER	BRONX NYC	NY	0301274	485-75	62076
7511221001	L401007426	CROSSWICK CREEK	NEW EGYPT	NJ		517-75	
7512310701	L410507355	HUDSON RIVER NIAK	TARRYTOWN	NY	0301587	1-76	62093
1976-1							
7601042001	L404007358	GOWANUS CANAL	BROOKLYN	NY		3-76	
7602130011	L414507242	CONNECTICUT RIVER	HARTFORD	CT		44-76	
7602230011	L404607350	EAST RIVER	QUEENS NY	NY	0300209		
7603181901	L404907407	PASSAIC RIVER	RUTHERFORD	NJ	0300299		
7604010801	L403907407	KILL VAN KULL	BAYONNE	NJ	0300359		
7604170801	L411907254	CONNECTICUT RIVER	NEW HAVEN	CT	0300420		
7604302101	L403007420	ARTHUR KILL	PERTH AMBOY	NJ	0300476		
7605080011		UPR NEW YORK HRBR	ELLIS ISLAND	NY		62351	
7605261701	L404407405	HACKENSACK RIVER	JERSEY CITY	NJ	0300588	134-76	
7606210401	L403507404	LOWER NEWYORK BAY	STATEN ISLAND	NY	0300734		
7610052201	L404207409	NEWARK BAY	PORT NEWARK	NJ	0301230		
7610060011	L404007413	DRAINAGEDITCH	PORT ELIZABT	NJ		201-76	
7610100101	L425007345	HUDSON RIVER	ALBANY	NY	0301256		
7610230001	L403707339	MIDDLE BAY	OCEANSIDE	NY	0301310		
7610290221	L403207415	ARTHUR KILL	PERTH AMBOY	NJ	0301328	212-76	70771
7611301101	L402507414	WOODBRIDGE CREEK	CARTERET	NJ		7-77	
7612301101	L404007402	NEWYORK HARBOR	NEW YORK	NY		253-76	72379
1977-1							
7701021201	L423507345	ISLAND LR HUDSONR	ALBANY	NY	0300004		
7701030901	L404707403	HACKENSACK RIVER	SECAUCUS	NJ	0300014	12-77	
7701111201	L422207348	HUDSON RIVER	STUYVESANT	NY	0300022		
7702012001	L403207415	ARTHUR KILL	PERTH AMBOY	NJ	0300096		
7702041901	L412107357	HUDSON RIVER MP50	HILAND FALLS	NY	0300115	35-77	71547
7702271001	L403607340	REYNOLDS CHANNEL	LONG BEACH	NY	0300200		
7703050901	L404207402	MORRIS CANAL	JERSEY CITY	NJ	0300243	69-77	

7703070011	HEMPSTEAD HARBOR	NEW YORK	NY	71357
7704110801	HUDSON RIVER	POUGHKEEPSIE	NY 0300373	
7705221501	HARLEM RIVER	NEW YORK CITY	NY	103-77
7706020201	HUDSON RIVER	PEEKSKILL	NY 0300660	
7707171301	CONNECTICUT RIVER	NEW HAVEN	CT 0300866	
7708130001	PLATTY KILL CREEK	BAYONNE	NJ	141-77
7708260901	NEWARK BAY	PORT NEWARK	NJ 0301113	
7709081701	UPPER NEWYORK RAY	BROOKLYN	NY 0301227	
7709230011	PASSAIC RIVER	LYNDHURST	NJ 0301952	
1974-77	LOCATION OR QUANTITY UNCERTAIN			
7402190011	CONNECTICUT RIVER	EAST HARTFRD	CT	42779
7409270011	SHINNECOCK	NEW YORK	NY	
7411090011	PORT RICHMOND	STATEN IS	NY	53131
7510111001	EAST RIVER	RAINEY PARK	NJ 0301294	
7706150001				117-77

DELAWARE BAY REGION-1				
1974-1				
7401040801	DELAWARE RIVER	RORDENTOWN	NJ 0300014	
7402051501	INLAND	EMAUS	PA 0300954	42770
7402191201	DELAWARE RIVER	PAULSBORO	NJ 0300195	
7404092201	DELAWARE RIVER	PHILADELPHIA	PA 0300395	4-75 51363
1975-1				
7501310101	DELAWARE RIVER	MARCUS HOOK	PA 0300151	288-75 52961
7504241901	DELAWARE RIVER	PHILADELPHIA	PA 0300471	
7504030011	ATLANTIC OCEAN	112M OFF SHR		61974
7506171611	SALEM RIVER	SALEM	NJ	400-75
7506171621	DELAWARE RIVER	CAMDEN	NJ 0300732	
7507280001	DELAWARE RIVER	BRISTOL	PA	095-77
7509140901	DELAWARE RIVER	PHILADELPHIA	PA 0301162	
7511041201	DELAWARE RIVER	CHESTER	PA 0301387	
1976-1				
7601021301	DELAWARE RIVER	MARCUS HOOK	PA 0300010	
7602250101	DELAWARE RIVER	WESTVILLE	NJ 0300214	
7604291501	DELAWARE RIVER	GLoucester C	NJ 0300474	120-76 62342
7607012201	INLAND	STAYTONVILLE	NJ 0300962	
7609160001	INLAND	HAVENFORD	PA	185-76

7612051501	L395607513	DELAWR-SHYLKLL RV	PHILADELPHIA PA	0301465
7612281601	L394807525	DELAWARE RIVER	MARCUS HOOK PA	0301555
1977-1				247-76 77680
7701121001	L395707511	DELAWR-SHYLKLL RV	PHILADELPHIA PA	0300042
7701201301	L395807506	DELAWARE RIVER	CAMDEN NJ	0300052
1974-77	LOCATION OR QUANTITY UNCERTAIN			
7510031401	INLAND-102		PA	0301265
7510310101	INLAND-102		PA	0301382
7511221001	INLAND-102		NJ	0301462
7612200011	DELAWARE RIVER	PAULSBORO NJ		71185
7704090011	SHUYLKILL RIVER	PHILADELPHIA PA		72873

# LOUISIANA COAST REGION-1

1974-1				
7401101101	L294909015	LAKE SALVADOR	BARATARIA LA	0804755
7401152001	L300409145	GRAND LAKE EAST	MARTINVILLE LA	0804824
7401180801	R LM 01195	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	GOOD HOPE LA	0801920
7404190001	L294809129	RAYOU TECHE	IRISH BEND LA	0801070
7406221511	R LM 01050	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	NEW ORLEANS LA	0804543
7406221521	R LM 01061	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	NEW ORLEANS LA	5-75
7406300801		COASTAL	LA	0802997
7408272201	R IW 02320	LAKE CHARLES	LAKE CHARLES LA	56-75
7409010801	L291708922	MISSISSIPPI RVR	GRAND PASS LA	0802373
7409101601	L293208835	GULF OF MEXICO	CHANDELEUR-I LA	63-75
7409160701		COASTAL	LA	69-75
7410211801	R LM 01760	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	DONALDSVILLE LA	0803663
7412220201	L285309041	GULF OF MEXICO	ISL DERNIERS LA	0804046
7412241901	R LM 00883	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	MEHAUX LA	134-75 51257
1975-1				235-75
7501291801	R LM 00870	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	MEHAUX LA	236-75
7502170011	L292908943	LAKE WASHINGTON	PORT SULPHUR LA	281-75 53259
7503120201	R LM 01255	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	GOODHOPE LA	312-75
7503301601	R LM 00260	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	BOOTHVILLE LA	0800859
7504160201	R LM 00850	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	MEHAUX LA	0801019
7504251401	R LM 01020	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	NEW ORLEANS LA	0801274
7505201201	R LM 02280	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	BATON ROUGE LA	0801375
				361-74 60130
				370-75 52579

7507181101	L294009120	BAYOU TECHE	PATTERSON	LA	425-75	
7507190011	INTCWY/WXLAKOUTL	CHANDELEUR	LA		61262	
7508110201	L293309145	EASTCOTE BLANCHE	MARSH ISLAND	LA	0803891	
7508120801	L292708927	GULFOFMEXICO	COQUILLE BAY	LA	445-75	
7508120901		COASTAL-401	LA	0802912		
7508150101	L282509255	GULFOFMEXICO GC	100MSTH/GRJK	LA	0802760	444-75 60909
7509090901	L293308924	GULF OF MEXICO	COQUILLE BAY	LA	0803260	464-75
7510161001	L293909200	VERMILION RAY	REDFISH PT	LA	0803699	
7511180001		GRAND LAKE	CAMERON PRSH	LA	514-75	
1976-1						
7602142201	L292508932	GULF OF MEXICO	RURAS	LA	0802119	42-76
7602200411	R LM 01132	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	KENNER	LA	0802157	
7602241501	R LM 00888	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	MERAUX	LA	0802193	63-76 62881
7602290701	L290609111	GULF OF MEXICO	CAILLOU BAY	LA	0802228	71-76
7603010101	L293809056	BAYOU BLACK	GIBSON	LA	0803001	70-76
7603170401	L291409000	BAYOU RIGAUD	GRAND ISLE	LA	0803110	86-76
760329		LAKE CHARLES	LAKE CHARLES	LA		092-76
7604072201	L295909012	HOEYS CANAL	CHALMETTE	LA	0804072	101-76
7604140011	R IW 01000	GULF INL WWY WHL	FRANKLIN	LA		71559
7604151701	L293209330	GULF OF MEXICO	OFF CAMERON	LA	0860411	
7604240021	R LM 02310	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	BATON ROUGE	LA		63298
7607081601	R LM 00962	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	NEW ORLEANS	LA	0807057	159-76 70384
7607121301	L290908920	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	GRAND PASS	LA		164-76
7608190601	L283509115	GULF OF MEXICO	65MSTHMGNCY	LA	0808175	
7609252001	R LM 00890	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	CHALMETTE	LA		187-76
7610060011	R LM 00800	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	BRAITHWAITE	LA		72030
7610080601	L301109132	GRAND LAKE EAST	MARTINVILLE	LA	0810055	
7610190201	L284109216	GULF OF MEXICO	70MSTHGRANLW	LA	0810119	
7610221601	L290908920	EAST BAY	SO-WEST PASS	LA	0810146	
7612181001	L282109130	GULF OF MEXICO	90MSTHFRNKLN	LA	0812139	
1977-1						
7701210201	R LM 01269	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	GOOD HOPE	LA		021-77
7702260601	R LM 02220	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	BATON ROUGE	LA		053-77
7703010201	R LM 00080	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	PILOTSTOWN	LA	0803002	
7703311401	L302208855	GULF OF MEXICO	BILOXI	MS	0850336	
7704011101	R LM 02280	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	BATON ROUGE	LA	0804003	
7704231701	L295409202	INLAND BAYOU TIGR	HENRY	LA	0804146	
7705131301	L300409030	DRAINAGE DITCH	LAPLACE	LA		096-77

7705000011	L285608923	GULF OF MEXICO	80MSTHIN-ORL	LA	0805145	
7706141101	L291909000	BAY MELVILLE	GRAND ISLE	LA		113-77
7706252201	R IW 00235	MISSISSIPPI RIVER		LA	0860633	
7707220011	R LM 00890	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	CHALMETTE-NO	LA		73600
7708050901	R IW 00550	GULF INL WWAY WHL	HOUMA	LA	0808022	128-77
7708180601	R LM 01252	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	GOOD HOPE	LA	0808124	
7709130601	R LM 01154	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	RESERVE	LA		140-77
7710181301	L291508849	GULF OF MEXICO	MAIN PASS	LA	0810084	150-77
7711260301	R LM 00954	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	NEW ORLEANS	LA	0811177	
7712071101	L300709059	INLAND	PLATTENVILLE	LA	0812063	
7712151201	R LM 01816	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	DONALDSVILLE	LA	0812090	
1974-77	LOCATION OR QUANTITY UNCERTAIN					
7401010011		INLAND		LA	0802306	
7403301111		INLAND		LA	0802307	
7403301121		INLAND		LA	080 773	
7410130011	R IW 01740	GLF INLWAY WHL	LAKE CHARLES	LA		51698
7501091201		INLAND-107		LA	0801092	
7501130011	R LM 01070	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	KENNER	LA		51586
7510120011		GULF OF MEXICO176	EUGENE ISLND	LA		61265
7601000011		GULF OF MEXICO		TX		61793
7602170011		GULF OF MEXICO		TX		61849
7605100011	R LM 00900	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	CHALMETTE	LA		70150
7610200021	R LM 01210	MISSISSIPPI RIVER	GOOD HOPE	LA		73429
7611130011		GULF OF MEXICO175	EUGENE ISLND	LA		70725

# NORTH TEXAS COAST REGION-1

1974-1						
7401250001	L301509444	INLAND	KOUNTZE	TX	0800662	
7402021101	L295809351	SABINE LAKE	PORT NECHES	TX	0800034	
7403110001	L294409523	PRAYS BAYOU	HOUSTON	TX	0800499	
7403151701	L302809419	INLAND	BESSMAY	TX	0802212	
7403160001	L302309415	INLAND	BUNA	TX	0800511	
7404020601	L284209539	BROWN CEDAR CVT	MATAGORDA PA	TX	0800708	
7404290001	L304709426	GALVESTON BAY	BAYTOWN	TX	0801087	
7407082201	L293709500	GALVESTON BAY	RED BLUFF	TX	0803895	6-75 50547



7407210001	L295009357	SABINE LAKE	LAKEVIEW	TX	0801834	
7408051601	L300209359	NECHES RIVER	BEAUMONT	TX	0801956	11-75
7408060001	L294509523	BRAYS BAYOU	HOUSTON	TX	0801949	18-75
7410170001	L292209505	INLAND	ALTA LOMA	TX		137-75
7412211001	L292209454	TC INDUSTRIAL CNL	TEXAS CITY	TX	0804435	
1975-1						
7501040601	L292409454	TC INDUSTRIAL CNL	TEXAS CITY	TX		245-75
7501211201	L292009500	HIGHLAND BAYOU	TEXAS CITY	TX	0803906	
7504101901	L291509525	FLORES BAYOU	DANBURY	TX	0803842	
7505330011		GULF OF MEXICO	GALVESTON	TX		53136
7508111501	L293509528	CLEAR CREEK	FRIENDSWOOD	TX	0804644	443-75
7510040601	L291909447	WEST BAY	GALVESTON IS	TX	0803504	479-75
7511211101	L293409425	IWY EAST BAY	HIGH ISLAND	TX	0803976	
7512241801	L292209453	TC INDUSTRIAL CNL	TEXAS CITY	TX	0804325	541-75
1976-1						
7601142301	L295909353	NECHES RIVER	PORT NECHES	TX	0860112	
7601271601	L300009359	NECHES RIVER	PORT NECHES	TX	0860114	
7603151001	L285609520	BRAZOS RIVER	FREEPORT	TX		85-76
7605040301	L293009453	GALVESTON, BAY	SMITH POINT	TX	0830502	122-76
7606280011		HOUSTON SHP CANAL	HOUSTON	TX		63232
7609260101	L295809351	SABINE LAKE	LAKEVIEW	TX	0860928	188-76
7611290801	L292209454	GALVESTON BAY	SAN LEON	TX	0831120	
1977-1						
7703281301	L302009425	INLAND	FRED	TX	0887390	
7708091401	L285709522	GULF OF MEXICO	25MSTHFREPRT	TX	0830809	
7709191701	L294409505	HOUSTON SHIP CNL	DEERPARK	TX	0840912	143-77
7710310401	L292109448	GALVESTON BAY	SMITH POINT	TX	0831036	154-77
7711260201	L301509530	INLAND	CONROE	TX	0888082	
7712021911	L294309512	HOUSTON SHIP CNL	HOUSTON	TX	0840518	167-77
1974-77	LOCATION OR QUANTITY UNCERTAIN					
7402280011				TX	0800378	
7403290011				TX	0800770	
7404190011				TX	0801071	
7405020801				TX	0805016	
7405220011				TX		42490
7406050011				TX	0802309	
7406200011				TX	0802506	
7406200021				TX	0801636	
7406211401				TX	0802511	

IWY/HSTNSHPCANAL HOUSTON

7406272301  
7409190011  
7409200011  
7409260011  
7409270301  
7409280901  
7410030011  
7410170011  
7410170901  
7410240011  
7410310011  
7410310301  
7411030011  
7412080011  
7412191001  
7412230011  
7501070301  
7501071201  
7501161001  
7607060011

DUPONT TERL DOCKS BEAUMONT

TX 0802311  
TX 0802343  
TX 0802438  
TX 0802498  
TX 0803901  
TX 0804540  
TX 0802589  
TX 0802665  
TX 0804546  
TX 0803230  
TX 0803239  
TX 0804547  
TX 0804549  
TX 0804551  
TX 0804593  
TX 0804574  
TX 0801035  
TX 0801079  
TX 0801440  
TX

62491



COL 9 SOURCE TYPE CODE, AS PER PIRS CODING MANUAL CG-450.  
 COL 10 NAME OF SOURCE, WHEN AVAILABLE.  
 COL 11 IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF SOURCE. THIS IS USUALLY VESSEL NUMBER.  
 CALL SIGN OR OTHER NUMBER RECORDED IN PIRS FILE.  
 COL 12 CAUSE/FACTOR CODE LETTERS AND DESCRIPTION, ASSIGNED ACCORDING  
 TO PIRS CODING MANUAL, CG-450.  
 COL 13 PIRS CODE FOR OIL TYPE.  
 COL 14 QUANTITY OF OIL SPILLED, IN THOUSANDS OF GALLONS, FOLLOWED BY  
 LETTER INDICATING SOURCE OF ESTIMATE: P=PIRS, N=NRC, V=VCF.  
 THE LETTERS LV, MV, HV INDICATE LIGHT, MEDIUM, AND HEAVY POLLUTION  
 INDICATORS IN THE VCF COMPUTER FILE.

COL 8	9	10	11	12	13	14
DATE/TIME	SOURCE TYPE	NAME	ID	CAUSE/FACTOR	OIL	QTY

# NEW YORK REGION-2

1974-2						
7401041302	502 ONS FACY	HBRTUG	00000089	BK TNKRPT	1022	19P
7401110102	034 TNK BARG	(RVRTUG)	ON267113	BB TNKRPT	GROUNDG 1040	11P
7401190602	034 TNK BARG		ON540064	AB HLLRPT	GROUNDG 1052	34P
7401231002	500 ONS FACY		00000089	IC PIPRPT	CURKOSN 1050	20P
7402030102	034 TNK BARG	NEW LONDON	ON266528	AB HLLRPT	GROUNDG 1050	10P
7402202402	101 ONS TRFR		07000044	WK FLNGLK	ERROR 1041	42P
7403111902	035 TNK BARG		ON004408	AB HLLRPT	GROUNDG 1061	10P
7403251602	900	SATURN	00000089	YC NATURL	LEACHNG 1095	10P
7405052102	900 UNSPECFD		00000099	SK TNKOFL	FLN/GLS 1099	92P
7405052102	900 TNK BARG	OILBARG-34	00000044	AE HLLRPT	CURROSN 1041	21P
7407011402	057 PUB VSSL		ON220307	BE TNKRPT	SINKING 1050	30P
7407141902	036 TNK BARG		CSODELMD	OL FLNGFL	OVP/RSR 1052	21P
7407190102	034 TNK BARG	(TGCLTKHO)	ON270766	AB HLLRPT	GROUNDG 1011	130P
7407310802	101 ONS TRFR		48644829	SG TNKOFL	IMP/MTN 1022	940P
7408041602	054 PSR VSSL		UN251566	BE TNKRPT	SINKING 1052	10P
7408211202	101 ONS TRFR		00079529	YC NATURL	LEACHNG 1011	15P
7410050902	302 RMY FFAC		00000040	RP EOPFLR	1052	32P
7410060102	015 FREIGHTR	MESSNKBARG	CS00SWYJ	AB HLLRPT	GROUNDG	105P
7411132302	034 TNK BARG	T/R #75	UN529170	AB HLLRPT	GROUNDG 1052	20P
7412091102	401 ONS PPL		00000046	CL PPLRPT	1040	20P
7412301502	503 ONS PNT		00000029	XG SABOTG	VANDALM 1001	15P

1975-2	PLNT	ONS	503	00040729	RP	EQPFLR	1011	20P
77501070402	UNK	999			ZZ		1097	10P
77501102302	PLNT	503	00000091	IC	PIPRPT	CORROSN	1022	12P
77503141002	SHIP	017	CS005MQM	AF	HLLRPT		1001	10P
77503290902	SHIP	015	ON245104	AB	HLLRPT	COLLISN	1022	32P
77503291802	TRFR	101	00018929	ML	VLVFLR	OVRPRSR	1061	21P
77504090702	BARG	034	ON561792	AB	HLLRPT	GROUNDG	1050	102P
77510071902	PPLN	401	00021529	CQ	PPLRPT		1041	250N
77511221002	BARG	014	ON537022	AA	HLLRPT	CO/FDOB	1040	90P
77512310702	TANK	502		RQ	TNKRPT		1050	2500P
1976-2	UNKNOWN	999		ZZ		UNKNOWN	1080	UNKN
77601042002	PLNT	503	00000029	IP	PIPRPT		1040	10P
77602130012	PLNT	503		ZZ			1052	30P
77603181902	VSSL	000	14218929	OP	FLGFLR		1040	20P
77604010802	STFY	502	ON258944	AA	HLLRPT	CO/FLOB	1099	30P
77604170802	NNT	508	00000029	BQ	TNKRPT		1052	40P
77604302102	PPLN	034		ZZ			1052	150P
77605080012	TNK	502	00086129	IA	PPLRPT		1011	30P
77605261702	STFY	999	36301229	YC	NATURL	LEACHNG	1022	15P
77606210402	UNKNOWN	401		BM	TNKRPT	OVRPRSR	1011	500N
77610052202	DUMP	900		SK	TNKOFL		1011	150P
77610060012	TRSF	101	CS005MTV	AB	HLLRPT	GROUNDG	1000	190N
77610100102	STFY	502	00038729	CQ			1022	80N
77610230002	SHIP	016	ON279964	BA	TNKRPT	COLLISN	1020	13N
77610290222	PIPELINE	401		TG	VLVLEK	IMP-OPN	1011	13P
77611301102	PPLN	401	00000029	RP	EQPFLR		1040	25P
77612301101	BARG	034	00000040	AG	HLLRPT	WEATHER	1021	15P
1977-2	BKTR	101	ON535880	AB	HLLRPT	GROUNDG	1052	160P
77701021202	CGTR	301	ON277709	BB	TNKRPT	GROUNDG	1052	420P
77701030902	BARG	034	00000029	RJ	TNKRPT	MTL-FLT	1040	90P
77701111202	BARG	034	00000029	YC	NATURL	LEACHNG	1040	150P
77702012002	BARG	502	ON238601	AA	HLLRPT	CU/SNOB		MV
77702041902	STFY	502	00000000	IP	PIPRPT		1050	16P
77702271002	STFY	502		WG	VALVLK	IMP-OPN	1050	10N
77703050902	STFY	051	07508529	SG	TNKOFL	IMP-OPNN	1011	147P
77703070012	FRT	900						
77704110802	MIS	500						
77705221502	ONS	500						
77706020202	CGTR	101						

7707171302	500	UNS	FACY		00000082	IH	PIPRPT	PIP-CUT	1040	50P
7708130002	503	ONS	PLNT	RAYON-INDY		ZZ	UNKNWN			2000N
7708260902	101	ONS	CGTR		28000029	BQ	TNKRPT		1040	30P
7709081702	050	CRG	SHIP		CS00908A	WL	ERROR		1052	10P
7709230012	304	HWY	FLNG		00084029	BO	TNKRPT	CORROSN	1011	40P
1974-77			LOCATION OR QUANTITY UNCERTAIN							
7402190012	034	TNK	BARG	BLULIN-108	ON272218	AB	HLLRPT	GROUNDG		LV
7409270012	053	FSG	VSSL	MV-HOOKER	ON298620	AB	HLLRPT	FOUNDGR		LV
7411090012	034	TNK	BARG	TB-RTC-200	ON176520	AQ	HLLRPT	EXP-FIR		LV
7510111002	500	ONS	FACY			SG	TNKOFL	IMP-OPN	1040	18P
7706150002	500	ONS	FACY	HEATINGPLT		IP	PIPRDT			N

# DELAWARE BAY REGION-2

1974-2										
7401040802	501	ONS	REFY		49561129	BN	TNKRPT		1022	600P
7402051502	500	ONS	FACY		00000022	WK			1052	18P
7402191202	017	VESSEL		ATHOS		AA	HLLRPT	COLISN	1052	285P
7404092202	015	TANKER		MVELIAS GR	CS00SZOP	AC	EXPLSN		1001	13P
1975-2										
7501310102	018	TANKER		CORINTHOS	ON001916	AA	HLLRPT	CO/MDVS	1000	500P
7504241902	502	ONS	FACY		00000029	YC	LEACHG		1052	14P
7504030012	034	TNK	BARG	JANET C	ON532513	AA	HLLRPT	CO/FSVS		
7506171612	502	TNK	STRG		00000029	BN	HLLRPT		1040	50N
7506171622	501	ONS	REFY		00000029	BN	TNKRPT		1040	11P
7507280002	503	ONS	REFY	SUPERIORZN	00000033	YC	CHRONC	LEACHNG	1080	97N
7509140902	501	ONS	REFY		00040729	OD	FLNFLR	MAT/FLT	1052	60P
7511041202	052	TOW	BOAT			HD	HLLRPT	STR/FLR	1095	73P
1976-2										
7601021302	101	ONS	TRSF		00000029	YC	NATURL	LEACHNG	1001	30P
7602250102	101	ONS	TRSF		00088329	SA	TNKOFL	INADSDG	1097	12P
7604291502	016	TNK	SHIP	TG241420	ON246993	AA	HLLRPT	CULIISN	1030	84P
7607012202	504	ONS	PRFY		00000029	XA	INIDCH	SALVAGE	1011	14P
7609160002	500	SUB	POOL			YC	SEEPAG		1080	80N
7612051502	503	ONS	PLNT		00000029	IP	PIPRPT		1052	110P
7612281602	016	TNK	SHIP	OLYMICGAMS	CS005MXW	AB	HLLRPT	GROUNDG	1000	134P
1977-2										
7701121002	999					ZZ			1040	16P
7701201302	501	ONS	RFNY		00019729	ZZ			1011	40P

1974-77	LOCATION OR QUANTITY UNCERTAIN						
7510031402	401 ONS PPLN	00061129	CF	PPLRPT		1011	99P
7510310102	201 RMY LQHK		RD	TNKRPT	OVR-TRN	1021	442P
7511221002	401 ONS PPLN	00021529	CQ	PPLRPT		1021	250P
7612200012	014 TNK SHIP	SSMOBLENRG	AA	HLLRPT	CO/FDOB		
7704090012	034 TNK BARG	INTERSTATE	AG	HLLRPT	FIRE-XP		LV

# LOUISIANA COAST REGION-2

1974-2							
7401101102	502 ONS FACY	00079529	JP	HOSRPT		1011	120P
7401152002	033 TNK BARG	ON264959	AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN	1000	158P
7401180802	401 ONS PPLN		CQ	PPLRPT		1000	1680P
7404190002	401 ONS PPLN	00000046	CQ	PPLRPT		1000	25P
7406221512	034 TNK BARG	ON524331	AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN	1000	1008P
7406221522	034 TNK BARG	ON524332	AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN	1000	240P
74063300802	052 TUG BOAT		HE	STRFLR	SINKING	1050	11P
7408272202	036 TNK2BARG		AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN	1000	23P
7409010802	999		ZZ			1041	14P
7409101602	402 OFS PPLN	00079529	IP	PPLRPT		1000	53P
7409160702	506 OFS PRFY	00000013	MP	VLVFLR	OTHER	1000	17P
7410211802	016 TANKER	CS00ICLY	AB	HLLRPT	GHOUSDG	1052	205P
7412220202	506 OFS WELL	00066613	FQ	BLUOUT		1000	40P
7412241902	033 TNK BARG	ON001339	SG	TNKOFL	VALVEOP	1000	63P
1975-2							
7501291802	034 TNK BARG	TS-86(9VS)	BA	TNKRPT	COLLISN	1001	63P
7502170012	999		ZZ			1000	65P
7503120202	401 ONS PPLN	00000044	MP	VLVELK	VLVEFLR	1052	25P
7503301602	503 ONS PLNT	00018929	CA	PPLRPT	COLLISN	1001	11P
7504160202	015 TANKER	CS0062RU	AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN	1050	23P
7504251402	035 TNK BARG	CG002006	AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN	1001	210P
7505201202	402 OFS PPLN	00000046	CI	PPLRPT	PPLDMGE	1040	114P
7507181102	03 TNK BARG		AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN	1000	13P
7507190012	034 TNK BARG	BARG-7041					MV
7508110202	401 ONS PPLN	MVSCORPION	AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN	1000	13P
7508120802	504 ONS PRFY		CQ	PPLRPT	OVERFIL	1001	17P
7508120902	504 ONS PRFY		SE	TNKOFL	OVR-FIG	1001	12P

7508150102	016	TANKER	GLOBTKSNKY	CS00ZFPS	AA	HLLRPT	CULLISN	1000	840P
7509090902	506	OFS PRFY		00005029	SE	TNKDFL	OVERFIL	1001	17P
7510161002	504	ONS PRFY		00000013	FQ	WL/BLO	BLOWOUT	1095	2520P
7511180002	900	OIL WELL	TEXACO		ZZ	UNKWN			42N
1976-2									
7602142202	506	OFS PRFY		00040713	CQ	PPLRPT		1001	56P
7602200412	000	UNK VSSL			HA	STRFLR	COLLISN	1095	55P
7602241502	034	TNK BARG	BARG SJT-4	ON263376	AA	HLLRPT	CULLISN	1001	16P
7602290702	402	OFS PPLN		00040746	CA	PPLRPT	CULLISN	1001	21P
7603010102	034	TNK BARG	T-B SULLY	ON501481	AC	HLLRPT		1001	59P
7603170402	506	OFS PRFY	(OIL/WTRSE	00023629	RP	VLVFLR		1001	40P
760329	401	ONS PPLN						1052	42N
7604072202	500	ONS STTK			OF	FLNFLR	IMPINST	1089	32P
7604140012	034	TNK BARG	T-B S 1511	512033	AA	HLLRPT			MV
7604151702	401	ONS PPLN			ID	PPLRPT	MAT/FLT	1095	21P
7604240022	034	TNK2BARG	T-B D+D1	509077	AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN		MV
7607081602	034	TNK BARG	(#501485)	ON268387	WK		COLLISN	1051	84P
7607121302	502	ONS BKST	(TANKFARM)	00040729	MP	VLVFLR		1001	39N
7608190602	000	UNK VSSL		ON512387	SE	TNKDFL	OVERFIL	1040	10P
7609252002	01	L	AMELIAGRML		KP	MFLRPT		1001	21P
7610060012	034	TNK BARG	MVJMRIVERS	ON528629	AB	HLLRPT	GROUNDG		
7610080602	506	OFS PRFY		00088313	CD	PPLRPT	CORROSN	1001	40P
7610190202	506	OFS PRFY		00018913	ZZ			1040	13P
7610221602	506	OFS PRFY		00069013	HQ	STRFLR		1001	11P
7612181002	506	OFS PRFY		00069013	CO	PPLRPT	CORROSN	1001	55P
1977-2									
7701210202	03	TNK BARG	BG NMS2600		AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN	1062	63N
7702260602	03	TNK BARG	TB DXE29		AB	HLLRPT	COLLISN	1001	14N
7703010202	999				ZZ			1001	11P
7703311402	999				ZZ			1061	14P
7704011102	033			ON512720	AQ	HLLRPT		1050	21P
7704231702	401	ONS PPLN		00088313	CO	PPLRPT	CORROSN	1001	50P
7705131302	503	ONS STFY	GENRTNG ST	00000049	PP	GSKFLR		1040	20N
7705000012	000				ZZ	UNKWN			

7706141102	401	ONS	PPLN	PIPELINE	00018929	CQ	PPLRPT	COLLISN	1001	176N
7706252202	034	TNK	BARG		ON502508	BA	TNKRPT	CO/FLDB	1052	168P
7707220012	01	TNK	SHIP	MVDCCLTRNS	GREEK	BA	TNKRPT			HV
7708050902	034	TNK	BARG	TBDELAWARE	ON260860	BA	TNKRPT	COLLISN	1041	63P
7708180602	034	TNK	BARG		ON269492	SK	TNKOFL		1052	17P
7709130602	01	TNK	SHIP	ATLTICMARQ	CSOOELOE	BA	TNKRPT	COLLISN	1001	74N
7710181302	402	OFS	PPLN	PIPELINE	00018929	CO	PPLRPT	CURROSN	1001	13P
7711260302	034	TNK	BARG		ON523761	BA	TNKRPT	COLLISN	1040	84P
7712071102	502	ONS	STFY		00000029	DQ	DIKRPT	DSGNFLT	1099	42P
7712151202	502	ONS	STFY		00000029	CO	PPLRPT	CURROSN	1001	11P
1974-77	LOCATION OR QUANTITY UNCERTAIN									
7401010012	504	ONS	PRFY		00023646	IH	PIPRPT	PIP-CUT	1000	32P
7403301112	401	ONS	PPLN		00007946	CA	PPLRPT	COLLISN	1000	15P
7403301122	401	ONS	PPLN		00007929	CF	PPLRPT	OTHER	1000	15P
7410130012	034	TNK	BARG	MYTH-HINES	ON263149	AB	HLLRPT	GROUNDG		LV
7501091202	502	ONS	STFY		00000029	XG	INTDCH	SAB-VAN	1000	13P
7501130012	034	TNK	BARG	CABIBE-71	ON176172	BB	HLLRPT	GROUNDG		LV
7510120012	057	RES	OCVL	MVIBERIA	ON272753	AA	HLLRPT	CORIGWR		LV
7601000012	014	OSPLVSSL		MVBRTLNCDS	ON554083	AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN		LV
7602170012	034	TNK	BARG	OFSHRFULEK	ON502611	AA	HLLRPT	CORGSTM		LV
7605100012	015	TANKER		MVMINILILY	GREEK	BA	HLLRPT	CORGNYYRR		LV
7610200022	015	TANKER		GEORGEPRNC	ON236825	AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN		LV
7611130012	057	COM	SYVL	MVMRGNCTYS	ON548778	AA	HLLRPT	CO/FLDB		

# NORTH TEXAS COAST REGION-2

1974-2										
7401250002	401	ONS	PPLN		00000046	CF	PPLRPT		1000	99P
7402021102	015	TANKER			CSOOELVD	XA	INTDSC	BLGPMGP	1000	17P
7403110002	401	ONS	PPLN		00000046	CQ	PPLRPT		1011	63P
7403151702	401	ONS	PPLN		00008513	CQ	PPLPPT		1099	13P
7403160002	401	ONS	PPLN		00008529	CQ	PPLRPT		1099	13P
7404020602	506	OFS	PRFY		00000013	RD	TNKRPT	OVERTRN	1040	10P
7404299902	401	ONS	PPLY			CA	PPLRPT	COLLISN	1000	176P
7407082202	034	TNK	BARG	T/B TM-10	ONS17243	AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN	1052	378P
7407210002	034	TNK	BARG		ON541952	AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN	1052	84P
7408051602	401	ONS	PPLN		00800046	CQ	PPLRPT		1011	84P





7409200012	504	ONS	PRFY	00000013	RA	EQPFLR	COLLISN	1000	21P
7409260012	504	ONS	PRFY	00000013	MP	VLVFLR	UNKNOWN	1000	12P
7409270302	504	ONS	PRFY	00000013	MP	VLVFLR	UNKNOWN	1000	12P
7409280902	401	ONS	PPLN	00023646	CQ	PPLRPT	UNKNOWN	1000	29P
7410030012	401	ONS	PPLN	00000029	NP	PMFPLR	UNKNOWN	1000	25P
7410170012	401	ONS	PPLN	00004946	CA	PPLRPT	COLLISN	1011	21P
7410170902	401	ONS	PPLN	00004946	CA	PPLRPT	COLLISN	1095	19P
7410240012	502	ONS	STFY	00000029	XG	PIPRPT	IMP-MTN	1095	40P
7410310012	401	ONS	PPLN	00000046	CN	PPLRPT	COLLISN	1000	11P
7410310302	501	ONS	RFRY	00000029	IL	PIPRPT	OVR-PRS	1000	11P
7411030012	999	UNKNOWN		00000091	MJ	VLVFLR	IMP-OPN	1097	20P
7412080012	999	UNKNOWN		00070029	ZZ	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	1097	17P
7412191002	401	ONS	PPLN	00000046	CQ	PPLRPT	UNKNOWN	1011	25P
7412230012	401	ONS	PPLN	00050846	CQ	PPLRPT	UNKNOWN	1000	15P
7501070302	401	ONS	PPLN	00084046	CQ	PPLRPT	UNKNOWN	1000	210P
7501071202	401	ONS	PPLN	00084046	CQ	PPLRPT	UNKNOWN	1000	210P
7501161002	401	ONS	PPLN	00084046	CL	PPLRPT	ERROR	1000	59P
7607060012	015	TNK	SHIP	UN4782LI	AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN		LV

SSOCEANCHT



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BARG = BARGE

BK = BULK

BLG = BILGE

BLO = BLOW (IN BLOWOUT)

CG (CRG) = CARGO

CO = COLLISN - COLLISION

CDH = DISCHARGE

CG = DMGE = DAMAGE

DIK = DIKE (DYKE)

EQP = EQUIPMENT

EXP = EXPLOSION

FCLY = FY = FACILITY

FD = FIXED

FIR = FIRE

FL = FLOATING

FLN = FLNG = FLANGE

FLR = FAILURE

FLT = FAULT

FUNG = FUELLING

FY = FCLY = FACILITY

GSK = GASKET

HBR = HARBOR

HLL = HULL

HOS = HOSE

HWY = HIGHWAY

IMP = IMPROPER

INT = INTENTIONAL

LDG ARM = LOADING ARM

LEACHING = LEACHING

LK = LEK = LEAK

LQ = LIQUID

MAT = MATERIAL

MD = MOORED

MFD = MANIFOLD

MIS = MISCELLANEOUS

MTN = MAINTENANCE

NATURL = NATURAL

OB = OBJECT

OC = OCEANOGRAPHIC

OFL = OVERFLOW

OFS = OFFSHORE

ONS = ONSHORE

OPN = OPERATION

OVERTRN = OVERTRN

OVR = OVER

PIP = PIPE

PLNT = PLANT

PMP = PUMP

PPL = PPLN = PIPELINE

PR = PRODUCTION

PRS = PRESSURIZATION

RES = RESEARCH

RPT = RUPTURE

RWY = RAILWAY

SAB = SABOTGE = SABOTAGE

SDG = SOUNDING

SM = SUBMERGED

SRCE = SOURCE

ST = STRG = STORAGE

STR = STRUCTURAL

TK = TNK = TANK

TR = TRFR = TRANSFER

TRMNL = TERMINAL

VAN = VANDALISM

VL = VSL = VESSEL

VLV = VLVE = VALVE

WR = WEATHER

XSV = EXCESSIVE

APPENDIX B  
ESTIMATION OF THE NUMBER OF OIL SPILLS WITH INFORMATION  
FROM TWO SOURCES

If 1,000 tagged trout are released into a lake in the spring, then the total trout population of the lake may be estimated by noting the fraction of tagged trout among all trout caught during the ensuing weeks. See Figure B-1. If, say, 5% of the specimens caught bear tags, then the population of trout may be estimated as approximately 20,000. This technique is subject to obvious errors, produced by such conditions as (1) unknown changes in the trout population, and (2) a non-representative sample being caught.

A modification of this technique may be used to estimate the true number of actual oil spills occurring over a period of time from the number reported through the USCG Pollution Incident Reporting System (PIRS) and through the National Response Center (NRC). Since the spills recorded by these two sources in 1974-77 have only a partial overlap, the true number of spills must be greater than reported by either. It can be estimated by applying elementary probability theory to some plausible assumptions, to be stated in what follows. As in the case of game population estimation, the method is subject to obvious qualifications.

CASE I, INDEPENDENT REPORTING

In the first case, it will be assumed that the two sources report randomly and independently. The probability




FIGURE B-1. POPULATION ESTIMATION TECHNIQUE

AD-A103 430

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS CENTER CAMBRIDGE MA  
A STUDY OF OIL SPILL RATES IN FOUR U.S. COASTAL REGIONS. (U)

**F/6 13/2**

**UNCLASSIFIED**

TSC-U5C0-80-3

USCG-D-26-81

NL

2 of 2  
AD  
4/03430



END

DATE  
FILMED

10-811  
DTIC


DTIC

# SIFIED

## 2 OF 2

### AD

## A/O 3430





that the first source records a spill, given that one has occurred, is assumed to be a constant  $P_1$ . Similarly, the probability that the second source records a spill, given that one has occurred, is assumed to be a constant,  $P_2$ . If a total of  $N$  spills occur, then the number recorded by the first source will be  $N_1$ , and that by the second will be  $N_2$ :

$$N_1 = P_1 N, \quad (B-1)$$

$$N_2 = P_2 N; \quad (B-2)$$

and the number recorded by both will be  $N_3$ :

$$N_3 = P_1 P_2 N. \quad (B-3)$$

This last equation depends upon the assumption of independent recording.

From (1), (2) and (3), one may estimate the probabilities  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ ,

$$P_1 = N_3/N_2 \quad (B-4)$$

$$P_2 = N_3/N_1 \quad (B-5)$$

and the total number of spills that occurred,  $N$ , as

$$N = N_1 N_2 / N_3. \quad (B-6)$$

#### CASE 2, NON-INDEPENDENT REPORTING

If the reporting sources influence one another then the above analysis does not apply. Moreover, the problem cannot be solved with only the data  $N_1$ ,  $N_2$  and  $N_3$  as above; its solution depends on additional parameters which often are more difficult to obtain.

Five mutually exclusive events can occur, if an oil spill is recorded:

- A: Source 1 records the spill, and source 2 does not
- B: Source 2 records the spill, and source 1 does not
- C: Source 1 records the spill, and source 2 obtains its record from source 1
- D: Source 2 records the spill, and source 1 obtains its record from source 2
- E: Both sources record the spill independently.

The number  $N_1$  of spills recorded by source 1 is calculated in terms of these events as:

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &= N P(A+C+E+D) \\ &= N P(A+C+E) + N P(D) \\ &= N P_1 + N P_{1/2} P_2 \end{aligned} \quad (B-7)$$

where  $P(X+Y)$  indicates the probability of events X or Y;  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are the probabilities of independent recording introduced before;  $P_{1/2}$  is the probability that source 1 obtains its record from source 2, given that source 2 has obtained its data independently; and N is the total number of spills that occur. Similarly, the number of spills recorded by source 2 is:

$$N_2 = N P_2 + N P_{2/1} P_1, \quad (B-8)$$

where  $P_{2/1}$  is the probability that source 2 obtains its record from source 1, given that source 1 has obtained its record independently. Finally, that number of spills that are contained in the records of both sources is  $N_3$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
N_3 &= N P(C+E+D) \\
&= N P(C) + N P(E) + N P(D) \\
&= N P_{2/1} P_1 + N P_1 P_2 + N P_{1/2} P_2 \quad (B-9).
\end{aligned}$$

It will be noticed that equations (7), (8) and (9) reduce to (1), (2) and (3) when  $P_{1/2}$  and  $P_{2/1}$  are zero. These two new probabilities are difficult to determine, and inject a degree of uncertainty into the estimates of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  and  $N$ . Nevertheless, the following expressions for  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$  and  $N$ , having  $P_{1/2}$  and  $P_{2/1}$  as parameters, will prove useful.

$$P_1 = N'_3 / N'_2, \quad (B-10)$$

$$P_2 = N'_3 / N'_1, \quad (B-11)$$

$$N = N'_1 / N'_2 / N'_3, \quad (B-12)$$

where

$$N'_1 = (N_1 - P_{1/2} N_2) / (1 - P_{1/2} P_{2/1}),$$

$$N'_2 = (N_2 - P_{2/1} N_1) / (1 - P_{1/2} P_{2/1}),$$

$$N'_3 = N_3 - P_{1/2} N'_2 - P_{2/1} N'_1.$$

Again, one notices that these equations reduce to the previous ones when  $P_{1/2}$  and  $P_{2/1}$  are zero. If one assumes, for simplicity, that  $P_{1/2} = P_{2/1} = \tau$  where  $\tau$  is a constant that will be termed the transfer probability, then it is possible to calculate, as a function of  $\tau$  the probabilities  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  of independent recording, and also the probability  $P_3$  that a spill will be recorded by either collection agency, i.e.,

$$P_3 = P_1 + P_2 - P_1 P_2. \quad (B-13)$$

The results of these calculations are shown in Table B-1. The results are there tabulated as a function of  $\tau$ , of the ratio  $N_1/N_2$ , and of the ratio  $\lambda$ ,

$$\lambda = N_3 / (N_1 + N_2 - N_3),$$

which is the fraction of reported spills that appear in the records of both sources. The quantity of ultimate interest, however, is  $P_3$ , the fraction of all spills that are recorded in either source. This fraction is plotted in Figure B-2 as a function of the transfer probability  $\tau (=P_{1/2} = P_{2/1})$ , with the overlap fraction  $\lambda$  as a parameter. The revealing aspect of these curves is that the recording probability decreases as the transfer probability increases, for a given fractional overlap. Moreover, the transfer probability can never exceed the overlap fraction. These limits on the transfer probability are seen in Figure B-2 as the points on the horizontal axis at which the recording probability goes to zero.

#### QUALIFICATIONS

The qualifications on trout population estimation apply to oil spills as well.

First, there is the assumption that one is dealing with a stable spill process. This is not a serious qualification if the estimates are taken to apply only to the time interval during which the reporting and spill processes actually occurred. Extrapolating to years following, or prior to, those for which the data are available can lead to obvious inaccuracies.

TABLE B-1. INDEPENDENT AND COMBINED RECORDING PROBABILITIES

$\lambda$	$\tau$	$P_1$	$P_2$	$P_3$
<u><math>N_1/N_2 = 1.0</math></u>				
.0	.0	.000	.000	.000
.1	.0	.182	.182	.331
	.1	.000	.000	.000
.3	.0	.462	.462	.710
	.1	.308	.308	.521
	.2	.154	.154	.284
	.3	.000	.000	.000
.5	.0	.667	.667	.889
	.1	.553	.553	.782
	.2	.400	.400	.640
	.3	.267	.267	.462
	.4	.133	.133	.249
	.5	.000	.000	.000
.7	.0	.824	.824	.969
	.1	.706	.706	.913
	.2	.588	.588	.830
	.3	.471	.471	.720
	.4	.353	.353	.581
	.5	.235	.235	.415
	.6	.118	.118	.221
	.7	.000	.000	.000
.9	.0	.947	.947	.997
	.1	.842	.842	.975
	.2	.737	.737	.931
	.3	.632	.632	.864
	.4	.526	.526	.776
	.5	.421	.421	.665
	.6	.316	.316	.532
	.7	.211	.211	.377
	.8	.105	.105	.199
	.9	.000	.000	.000
<u><math>N_1/N_2 = 1.4</math></u>				
.0	.0	.000	.000	.000
.1	.0	.218	.156	.341
	.1	.000	.000	.000

TABLE B-1. (CONTINUED)

$\lambda$	$\tau$	$P_1$	$P_2$	$P_3$
.3	.0	.554	.596	.730
	.1	.386	.256	.543
	.2	.205	.123	.303
	.3	.000	.000	.000
.5	.0	.800	.571	.914
	.1	.670	.443	.816
	.2	.533	.320	.683
	.3	.386	.204	.511
	.4	.218	.096	.293
	.5	.000	.000	.000
.7	.0	.988	.706	.997
	.1	.886	.586	.953
	.2	.784	.471	.886
	.3	.682	.359	.796
	.4	.578	.254	.685
	.5	.471	.157	.554
	.6	.353	.071	.399
	.7	.000	.000	.000
<u><math>N_1/N_2 = 1.8</math></u>				
.0	.0	.000	.000	.000
.1	.0	.255	.141	.360
	.1	.000	.000	.000
.3	.0	.646	.359	.773
	.1	.473	.228	.593
	.2	.269	.108	.348
	.3	.000	.000	.000
.5	.0	.933	.519	.968
	.1	.820	.395	.891
	.2	.700	.280	.784
	.3	.568	.174	.643
	.4	.400	.080	.448
	.5	.000	.000	.000

TABLE B-1. (CONCLUDED)

LEGEND: Given that a spill has occurred,

$P_1$  = probability spill is recorded independently by source 1,

$P_2$  = probability spill is recorded independently by source 2,

$P_3$  = probability spill is recorded by either source,

$\tau$  = probability one source obtains spill record from  
the other source,

and

$\lambda$  = fraction of all recorded spills that appear in both  
sources.




FIGURE B-2. PROBABILITY  $P_3$  OF A SPILL BEING RECORDED VS. TRANSFER PROBABILITY,  $t$



Second is the requirement that the sampling process, or in this case, the recording process, be representative. By that is meant that the two recording systems apply to the same population of spills, and that each has a fixed probability of recording any spill in that population. This is a more restrictive requirement. It is unrealized in practice to the extent that the spills (i.e., the spillers) seek out the recording system, rather than vice-versa. Reporting a spill to one of the systems, PIRS or NRC, is often considered adequate to insure that it will be reported to the other. Hence the probabilities  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  of independent reporting may not be descriptive, and the probability of two independent reports may not be  $P_1 P_2$ . Further, certain types of spills, such as those from industrial plants and tank farms may be more likely to be reported through the NRC, and others, such as those from vessel accidents may be more likely to be reported to or by the US Coast Guard PIRS. These conditions would invalidate the assumption that the reported spills are representative samples of all spills, taken with probabilities  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  from the entire population of spills.

#### MATHEMATICAL NOTE

The formula (6) for  $N$  can be obtained by a more sophisticated method, given in Reference 18, pages 41-45. It is shown there that the probability that there will be exactly  $N_3$  spills in common, given  $N_1$ ,  $N_2$ , and  $N$ , is a hypergeometric distribution, and the value of  $N$  for which that probability is a maximum is given by (6).

A valuable result of the development given in Reference 18 is that it is not necessary to assume that both PIRS and NRC reports are made at random and independently; it is enough to assume that either the PIRS or the NRC reports are random, provided they are independent.

Another result of value in Reference 18 is the Normal approximation to the hypergeometric distribution of  $N_3$ . It is seen from p. 180 of that Reference that  $N_3$  is Normally distributed with mean  $N_1 N_2 / N$  and variance  $N_1 N_2 (N - N_1) (N - N_2) / N^3$ . Thus, if one assumes a value for  $N$ , he may easily calculate the mean and variance of the observed overlap  $N_3$ .

APPENDIX C  
MOVEMENT OF CRUDE, HEAVY, AND LIGHT OILS IN 1974-1977 FOR FOUR  
GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

EXTRACTED AND EXTRAPOLATED FROM - "Waterborne Commerce of the United States" for 1974-1976, excluding ports and waterways with less than 10,000 tons annual oil movement.

ACOE oil movement data are available at present for the years 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977. Harbors and waterways having total oil movements of less than 10,000 tons/year were ignored. It is estimated that the the total amount of oil thus eliminated in any one region is less than 100,000 tons/year, or less than 0.2% of any regional oil flow.

The data were aggregated by oil type as follows (similar to Reference 9, p. 16):

<u>Oil Type</u>	<u>Commodity Classification Numbers</u>
Crude	1311
Heavy	2915, 2916, 2918
Light	2911, 2912, 2913, 2914, 2917.

The total oil movements tabulated for the four regions are given in the following listing by year and by port or waterway. In addition to the 10,000 tons/year exclusion, certain small rivers, canals and inland waterways were excluded. The major such exclusions, and other assumptions made in compiling the data for each region will now be discussed.

Greater New York: The greatest part of the traffic is contained in the Port of New York Consolidated Statement. This statement includes the Hudson River Channel up to 156th Street in Mahattan. The remainder of the Hudson River, through Troy, NY, may be obtained either from the statement for the Hudson River, Deepwater in Upper Bay, NY to Waterford, NY or from the statement for the Hudson River, Deepwater in Upper Bay, NY to Waterford, NY, or from the statement for the Hudson River, Mouth of Spuyten

Duyvil Creek to Watertford, NY. The former is slightly redundant with the Port of New York, Consolidated Report, while the latter leaves a slight gap in coverage from 156th Street to Spuyten Duyvil Creek. The redundancy was chosen.

The traffic through the Federal Lock at Troy was eliminated since this oil is accounted for in the Hudson River Traffic.

Delaware Bay: Almost all traffic in this region is contained in the Consolidated Report of the Delaware River, Trenton, NJ to the Sea. This tabulation includes all non-local traffic of Trenton, Philadelphia, Camden, Marcus Hook, Wilmington and the main tributaries of the Delaware. The Schuylkill River movements are also included, except local. Traffic on the inland waterway between the Delaware River and Chesapeake Bay was excluded, as was traffic on Mantua Creek, NJ.

Louisiana Coast: The major difficulty in this region concerned the choice of data to represent the New Orleans and Baton Rouge areas. On one hand, one may employ the data for the Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to New Orleans and New Orleans to the Mouth of the Passes. This provides a complete statement of the River movements from above Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico, with the through traffic called out separately. On the other hand, one may employ the data for the Port of Baton Rouge (Mile 168 through Mile 253) plus that for the Port of New Orleans (Mile 127 to Mouth of Passes). It was decided to employ the river data because the two separate Ports taken together still leave a section of the Mississippi River, from Mile 127 to Mile 168, unaccounted for. Examination of the data shows a significant amount of foreign crude oil passes through the New Orleans section of the Mississippi and lands in the Baton Rouge section of the Mississippi. This movement appears in the River data but not in the separate Ports data, presumably because of the gap in the Ports coverage.

Another difficulty in compiling the data in the Louisiana region is the method of handling oil movement on the Intra-coastal Waterway and other inland waterways. It will be noted

that the spill data for the Louisiana region includes several spills on the Intracoastal Waterway and one in Bayou Black. The inland waterways in the Louisiana region carry about 30 million tons of oil per year, of which about half is through movement. Although oil movement on these waterways is primarily barge traffic and hence not likely to result in massive spills, it nevertheless is a significant contributor to the spill rate and for that reason was included in the oil movement total for Louisiana.

North Texas Coast: Almost all oil movements in this region were included in this Appendix, the only exclusions being less than 100,000 tons annually. The movement on the Lake Charles Deepwater channel was assigned entirely to the Louisiana Coast region. Similarly, all of the movements on the Galveston-Corpus Christi section of the Intracoastal Waterway were included in the North Texas region.

General: Some general observations may be made on the use of ACOE data in calculating oil spill rates.

First, it appears that the selection of the appropriate types of oil movement is not an easy task. We have, in this Appendix, taken the aggregate of imports, exports, coastwise receipts and shipments, internal receipts and shipments, and local receipts and shipments. We also have included through traffic on the grounds that it is about as likely to produce spills as traffic in the other categories.

Second, it may be observed that consistency does not necessarily avoid biasing of the resultant spill rates. For example, inclusion of inland waterway traffic has a greater impact on the Louisiana Coast spill rate than on the spill rate of any other region, because of the large amount of waterway movement in Louisiana. The same may be said of the inclusion of through traffic, which also is heavy in the Louisiana Coast region.

ACOE OIL MOVEMENT DATA FOR FOUR US COASTAL AREAS  
1974 THROUGH 1977  
THOUSANDS OF SHORT TONS

	OCEANGOING-----		--- INTERNAL-----	
	FOREIGN	THROUGH	RECEIPTS	THROUGH
	AND		AND	
	COASTAL		SHIPMNTS	
NEW LONDON HARBOR, CT				
1974				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	50.8	0.0	0.9	0.0
HEAVY	1424.5	0.0	601.0	0.0
1975				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	258.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	2683.2	0.0	385.6	0.0
1976				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	265.5	0.0	0.4	0.0
HEAVY	2560.9	0.0	206.6	0.0
1977				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	261.0	0.0	1.7	0.0
HEAVY	1836.4	0.0	228.2	0.0
THAMES RIVER, CT				
1974				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	236.8	0.0	0.6	0.0
HEAVY	253.4	0.0	599.2	0.0
1975				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	250.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	133.6	0.0	385.6	0.0
1976				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	250.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	104.5	0.0	206.6	0.0
1977				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	263.0	0.0	1.7	0.0
HEAVY	48.1	0.0	228.2	0.0

# CONNECTICUT RIVER BELOW HARTFORD, CT

1974

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	1279.8	0.0	3.6	0.0
HEAVY	1752.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

1975

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	1116.4	0.0	3.5	0.0
HEAVY	1436.8	0.0	0.0	0.0

1976

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	1076.8	0.0	1.7	0.0
HEAVY	1136.3	0.0	0.0	0.0

1977

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	1064.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	1070.1	0.0	23.0	0.0

# NEW HAVEN HARBOR, CT

1974

CRUDE	42.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	7270.3	0.0	283.9	0.0
HEAVY	3325.1	0.0	27.1	0.0

1975

CRUDE	132.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	6940.6	0.0	291.4	0.0
HEAVY	3034.7	0.0	209.7	0.0

1976

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	9425.3	0.0	134.1	0.0
HEAVY	2886.2	0.0	81.6	0.0

1977

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	7201.3	0.0	115.1	0.0
HEAVY	2824.3	0.0	36.8	0.0

# BRIDGEPORT HARBOR, CT

1974

CRUDE	11.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	1376.0	0.0	72.8	0.0
HEAVY	1363.2	0.0	0.0	0.0

1975

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	1341.1	0.0	3.9	0.0
HEAVY	1151.4	0.0	29.2	0.0

1976

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	1574.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	1312.8	0.0	11.3	0.0

1977

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	1611.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	1247.9	0.0	3.1	0.0

NORWALK HARBOR, CT

1974

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	178.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	555.1	0.0	0.0	0.0

1975

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	201.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	543.5	0.0	0.0	0.0

1976

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	232.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	483.7	0.0	0.0	0.0

1977

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	207.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	573.1	0.0	0.0	0.0

STAMFORD HARBOR, CT

1974

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	485.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	55.2	0.0	0.0	0.0

1975

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	472.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	35.6	0.0	0.0	0.0

1976

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	456.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	62.3	0.0	0.0	0.0

1977

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	458.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	78.9	0.0	0.0	0.0

HEMPSTEAD HARBOR, NY

1974

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	684.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	223.7	0.0	0.0	0.0

1975

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	714.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	135.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

1976

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	578.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	288.7	0.0	0.0	0.0

1977

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	464.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	197.6	0.0	0.0	0.0



PORT JEFFERSON HARBOR, NY

1974				
CRUDE	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	3114.7	0.0	7.7	0.0
HEAVY	641.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1975				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	3150.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	650.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
1976				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	3171.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	609.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
1977				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	3448.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	654.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

PORT CHESTER HARBOR, NY

1974				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	157.6	0.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1975				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	169.0	0.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0
1976				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	176.2	0.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	7.9	0.0
1977				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	198.0	0.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0

OYSTER BAY HARBOR

1974				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	525.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1975				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	468.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1976				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	360.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	136.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
1977				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	374.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	12.9	0.0	0.0	0.0

TOTALS, LONG ISLAND SOUND

1974				
CRUDE	60.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	15201.8	0.0	519.4	0.0
HEAVY	9593.2	0.0	1227.3	0.0
1975				
CRUDE	132.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	14914.2	0.0	467.8	0.0
HEAVY	9805.7	0.0	1014.6	0.0
1976				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	17590.9	0.0	312.4	0.0
HEAVY	9581.7	0.0	514.0	0.0
1977				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	15255.6	0.0	316.5	0.0
HEAVY	8543.3	0.0	529.1	0.0

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT OF THE PORT OF NEW YORK

1974				
CRUDE	20005.3	0.0	1146.8	0.0
LIGHT	35387.7	0.0	26922.8	0.0
HEAVY	35194.5	0.0	20176.4	0.0
1975				
CRUDE	19886.4	0.0	1026.6	0.0
LIGHT	35723.9	0.0	23955.1	0.0
HEAVY	29616.3	0.0	19201.2	0.0
1976				
CRUDE	22833.5	0.0	2071.7	0.0
LIGHT	34200.2	0.0	24066.8	0.0
HEAVY	33951.3	0.0	20419.0	0.0
1977				
CRUDE	24266.6	0.0	2675.0	0.0
LIGHT	39270.0	0.0	24836.0	0.0
HEAVY	35633.4	0.0	19238.4	0.0

HUDSON RIVER, DEEPWATER IN UPPER BAY TO WATERFORD, NY

1974				
CRUDE	74.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	1490.9	0.0	8008.7	684.8
HEAVY	2671.2	92.5	5353.7	197.7
1975				

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	1504.5	0.0	7009.7	396.0
HEAVY	2730.8	22.0	4925.7	133.1
1976				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	1329.2	0.0	7834.3	475.7
HEAVY	3592.4	6.0	4672.1	104.6
1977				
CRUDE	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	1731.4	0.0	7504.2	517.3
HEAVY	3308.5	0.0	4364.6	125.8

DELAWARE RIVER, TRENTON NJ TO THE SEA CONSOLIDATED REPORT

1974				
CRUDE	47104.6	1292.5	9068.5	0.0
LIGHT	14146.1	3541.2	8047.0	1088.6
HEAVY	10597.7	2914.4	7254.8	484.7
1975				
CRUDE	47167.5	674.5	9992.8	0.0
LIGHT	12981.1	2505.6	6874.6	510.7
HEAVY	6909.0	2430.1	6437.3	304.4
1976				
CRUDE	52262.6	323.9	9846.7	0.0
LIGHT	11912.8	3198.1	6117.3	355.4
HEAVY	9247.5	2501.6	10163.3	142.6
1977				
CRUDE	54450.7	444.0	11044.3	0.0
LIGHT	12137.0	3992.7	1698.6	274.5
HEAVY	8941.0	2952.5	8810.2	239.9

GICWW, MOBILE BAY TO NEW ORLEANS, LA

1974				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	4.1	1424.2
LIGHT	0.0	77.9	272.3	4123.7
HEAVY	0.0	3.1	167.7	2917.4
1975				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	6.4	2553.8
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	252.0	4161.6
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	148.0	2785.7
1976				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	3.3	3485.2
LIGHT	0.0	39.7	125.7	3820.4
HEAVY	0.0	67.4	276.8	3379.7
1977				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	3466.0
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	20.1	4611.3
HEAVY	61.9	76.7	72.4	4113.0

GICWW, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SABINE RIVER

1974

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	10731.2	8259.8
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	717.7	5610.5
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	498.3	8433.2

1975

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	9672.6	7502.7
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	1069.5	5972.2
HEAVY	0.0	3.2	291.5	7523.5

1976

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	9448.3	7257.1
LIGHT	0.0	4.9	615.9	6899.6

HEAVY	0.0	29.4	377.9	8745.5
-------	-----	------	-------	--------

1977

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	8885.5	7309.7
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	752.7	8934.5
HEAVY	0.0	6.1	470.7	10600.2

GICWW, MORGAN CITY - PORT ALLEN ROUTE

1974

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	769.6	267.9
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	210.7	2357.6
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	3.7	3924.3

1975

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	685.7	514.9
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	248.8	2750.7
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	0.0	3784.4

1976

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	816.2	744.6
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	227.2	2975.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	0.0	3889.2

1977

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	560.9	347.0
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	287.4	3354.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	0.0	4219.5

HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA

1974

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	1369.2
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	2.2	67.8
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0

1975

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	1138.4
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	0.0	117.8
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

1976

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	1232.3
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	0.0	47.7
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

1977

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	0.0	1228.2
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	0.0	69.3
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

VERMANTEAU RIVER, LA

1974

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	1713.8	15.0
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	86.8	0.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0

1975

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	1254.5	0.0
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0

1976

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	1485.5	13.9
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	67.8	0.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

1977

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	1515.0	32.4
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0

MISSISSIPPI RIVER, NEW ORLEANS TO MOUTH OF PASSES

1974

CRUDE	7796.9	14833.3	12744.6	3008.9
LIGHT	1007.7	7854.2	4411.7	2771.3

HEAVY	1740.7	2330.6	5258.8	3343.6
-------	--------	--------	--------	--------

1975

CRUDE	6840.8	26568.2	13797.6	4975.0
LIGHT	1886.5	8089.7	3895.3	2682.6
HEAVY	1418.5	3351.1	4437.9	3256.4

1976

CRUDE	6345.7	43987.3	12933.5	4518.9
LIGHT	1140.6	7783.9	3720.4	1663.0
HEAVY	772.6	3832.0	4819.4	3124.5

1977

CRUDE	13548.8	65424.4	10670.4	5054.4
LIGHT	944.5	8761.8	3643.1	4572.7
HEAVY	748.6	4886.3	6463.1	5345.1

MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO NEW ORLEANS

1974

CRUDE	14833.4	0.0	8110.0	1964.3
LIGHT	7854.2	0.0	8523.4	4011.0
HEAVY	2328.4	0.0	7089.0	5177.2

1975

CRUDE	26568.3	0.0	8781.7	3044.0
LIGHT	8089.8	0.0	9066.9	3848.8
HEAVY	3336.2	8.6	6495.7	4791.3

1976

CRUDE	43987.3	0.0	8263.3	3049.9
LIGHT	7779.4	0.0	11077.6	4030.0
HEAVY	3801.6	0.0	8279.9	4086.4

1977

CRUDE	65424.4	0.0	7183.1	1734.5
LIGHT	8761.7	0.0	10412.0	3925.0
HEAVY	4863.9	0.0	9635.8	3956.7

CALCASTEU RIVER AND PASS, LA

1974				
CRUDE	2274.7	0.0	5583.7	0.0
LIGHT	1527.9	0.0	902.0	0.0
HEAVY	309.6	0.0	1021.4	0.0
1975				
CRUDE	4630.6	0.0	4760.4	0.0
LIGHT	1436.8	0.0	820.7	0.0
HEAVY	245.8	0.0	861.9	0.0
1976				
CRUDE	5738.0	0.0	4204.2	0.0
LIGHT	1914.8	0.0	1170.9	0.0
HEAVY	376.7	0.0	1290.3	0.0
1977				
CRUDE	8068.8	0.0	4674.1	0.0
LIGHT	3359.2	0.0	1929.8	0.0
HEAVY	195.7	0.0	1796.1	0.0

ATCHAFALAYA RIVER, LA

1974				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	224.0	959.3
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	166.9	529.8
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	149.7	1147.1
1975				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	274.2	729.9
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	277.0	323.5
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	144.1	594.9
1976				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	375.9	738.4
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	327.0	893.8
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	150.9	984.9
1977				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	301.9	479.0
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	465.6	740.7
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	195.8	947.8

TOTALS, LOUISIANA COAST

1974				
CRUDE	24905.0	14833.3	39881.0	17268.6
LIGHT	10389.8	7854.2	15293.7	19470.9
HEAVY	4378.7	2333.7	14197.0	24942.8
1975				
CRUDE	38039.7	26568.2	38133.3	20558.7
LIGHT	11413.1	8089.7	15631.7	19857.2
HEAVY	5000.5	3362.9	12379.3	22736.2
1976				
CRUDE	61071.0	43987.3	37530.2	21030.3
LIGHT	56071.0	43987.3	37530.2	21040.3
HEAVY	4950.9	3928.8	15195.2	24210.3
1977				
CRUDE	87042.0	65424.4	33790.9	16185.2
LIGHT	13065.4	8761.8	17490.6	21596.2
HEAVY	5808.2	4892.4	18561.5	25069.1

SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX

1974

CRUDE	10462.1	0.0	3991.6	5197.6
LIGHT	12587.1	0.0	4497.3	2646.9
HEAVY	4705.3	0.0	3254.6	5374.1

1975

CRUDE	17938.3	0.0	4365.2	4191.1
LIGHT	12008.3	0.0	4782.3	2789.3
HEAVY	3879.6	0.0	3536.5	4000.4

1976

CRUDE	32213.1	0.0	4832.6	4825.0
LIGHT	13115.6	0.0	3682.1	3364.7
HEAVY	5336.2	0.0	3980.9	5295.4

1977

CRUDE	38648.7	0.0	5559.2	4368.6
LIGHT	10980.7	0.0	3372.1	4719.4
HEAVY	5243.5	0.0	3938.5	5666.1

HOUSTON SHIP CANAL, TX

1974

CRUDE	14874.7	0.0	3934.2	0.0
LIGHT	15888.4	0.0	3863.5	0.0
HEAVY	3308.3	0.0	5892.1	0.0

1975

CRUDE	16012.3	0.0	2996.4	0.0
LIGHT	14535.5	0.0	2864.3	0.0
HEAVY	2997.6	0.0	5111.7	0.0

1976

CRUDE	22039.0	0.0	3466.6	0.0
LIGHT	14239.9	0.0	3449.7	0.0
HEAVY	2417.3	0.0	5961.4	0.0

1977

CRUDE	28191.7	0.0	3584.2	0.0
LIGHT	14437.8	0.0	7220.7	0.0
HEAVY	4935.2	0.0	8775.2	0.0

TEXAS CITY CHANNEL, TX

1974

CRUDE	2696.6	0.0	3576.2	0.0
-------	--------	-----	--------	-----

LIGHT	3296.0	0.0	2664.9	0.0
HEAVY	425.4	0.0	787.6	0.0

1975

CRUDE	5618.5	0.0	3466.1	0.0
LIGHT	5494.8	0.0	2332.0	0.0
HEAVY	574.2	0.0	745.6	0.0

1976

CRUDE	9598.6	0.0	2690.0	0.0
LIGHT	4556.6	0.0	3002.6	0.0
HEAVY	859.4	0.0	1012.2	0.0

1977

CRUDE	12887.3	0.0	3275.2	0.0
LIGHT	4282.6	0.0	4041.6	0.0
HEAVY	1179.3	0.0	1554.7	0.0

# GALVESTON CHANNEL, TX

1974

CRUDE	203.4	0.0	6.0	0.0
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	47.0	0.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	102.1	0.0

1975

CRUDE	233.3	0.0	16.5	0.0
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	52.4	0.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	74.8	0.0

1976

CRUDE	118.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	74.5	0.0
HEAVY	2.3	0.0	122.8	0.0

1977

CRUDE	493.9	0.0	15.7	0.0
LIGHT	70.8	0.0	42.6	0.0
HEAVY	7.8	0.0	173.3	0.0

# FREEPORT HARBOR, TX

1974

CRUDE	2260.1	0.0	1005.2	0.0
LIGHT	536.2	0.0	454.6	0.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	170.3	0.0

1975

CRUDE	3228.4	0.0	622.3	0.0
LIGHT	484.3	0.0	124.7	0.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	108.8	0.0

1976

CRUDE	4458.5	0.0	477.2	0.0
LIGHT	545.6	0.0	107.4	0.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	195.8	0.0

1977

CRUDE	9980.6	0.0	313.2	0.0
LIGHT	528.1	0.0	128.4	0.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	313.9	0.0

# MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX

1974

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	167.9	0.0
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0
HEAVY	61.1	0.0	8.5	0.0

1975

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	190.5	0.0
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	4.6	0.0
HEAVY	44.9	0.0	22.1	0.0

1976

CRUDE	0.0	0.0	178.3	0.0
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	13.4	0.0
HEAVY	27.8	0.0	16.9	0.0



1977				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	139.6	0.0
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	5.1	0.0
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	17.5	0.0

GICWW, SABINE RIVER TO GALVESTON, TX

1974				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	811.4	8785.4
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	1909.0	5093.4
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	1745.5	6827.6

1975				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	1184.8	7575.9
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	2672.6	4830.8
HEAVY	0.0	3.2	1688.8	5805.2

1976				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	1010.5	8783.7
LIGHT	4.9	0.0	1772.7	5665.1
HEAVY	4.0	25.4	1741.7	7186.8

1977				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	1446.1	8561.0
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	1837.1	7476.8
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	1898.5	8693.1

GICWW, GALVESTON TO CORPUS CHRISTI, TX

1974				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	2102.9	2130.4
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	271.2	2682.8
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	355.8	1349.1

1975				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	2414.8	1845.1
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	621.3	1385.7
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	208.6	964.8

1976				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	1469.3	2438.0
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	154.4	1352.2
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	254.0	1290.2

1977				
CRUDE	0.0	0.0	1948.7	2723.6
LIGHT	0.0	0.0	214.0	1855.7
HEAVY	0.0	0.0	268.3	1655.2

---

TOTALS, NORTH TEXAS COAST

1974

CRUDE	19834.8	0.0	11603.8	10915.8
LIGHT	19721.5	0.0	19211.7	7776.2
HEAVY	3369.4	0.0	9061.9	8176.7

---

1975

CRUDE	43030.8	0.0	15256.6	13612.1
LIGHT	32522.9	0.0	13454.2	9014.8
HEAVY	7496.3	3.2	11496.9	10770.4

---

1976

CRUDE	68427.9	0.0	14124.5	16046.7
LIGHT	32462.6	0.0	12256.8	10382.0
HEAVY	8647.0	25.4	13285.7	13774.4

---

1977

CRUDE	90202.2	0.0	16281.9	15653.4
LIGHT	30300.0	0.0	16861.6	14051.9
HEAVY	11365.8	0.0	16942.9	17014.4

---

## APPENDIX D

### TRIPS OF TANKERS, TANK BARGES, AND ALL VESSELS IN 1974-1977 FOR FOUR GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

EXTRACTED AND EXTRAPOLATED FROM - "Waterborne Commerce of the United States"(Army Corps of Engineers) for 1974-1976, excluding ports and waterways with less than 10,000 tons annual oil movement.

The vessel trip data here tabulated were extracted from the ACOE volumes for the same waterways as were the tonnage data of Appendix C, with few exceptions. (1) The trip data do not include a consolidated statement of the Port of New York, analogous to that found in the tonnage data. Therefore, the trip data for the separate waterways that constitute the Port of New York as given in Table D-1 were summed to arrive at an equivalent consolidated statement of the Port of New York. (2) The Waterways given in Table D-2 were summed and are shown on the listing as Louisiana Inland Waterways. The list of Table D-2 includes six waterways (items 5 through 8) that are not included in the tonnage movement data of Appendix C, but these waterways comprise a relatively small fraction of all vessel trips in Louisiana. Hence the Louisiana Coast vessel trip data, for all practical purposes, covers the same waterways as the tonnage data.

TABLE D-1. WATERWAYS IN THE NEW YORK CONSOLIDATED  
STATEMENT, ACOE DATA

The following waterways make up the Port of New York in the ACOE consolidated statement:

Eastchester Creek, NY  
Bronx River, NY  
Westchester Creek, NY  
Manhasset Bay, NY  
Flushing Bay and Creek, NY  
Harlem River, NY  
Hudson River, NY (Lower section)  
Hudson River Channel, NY and NJ  
East River, NY  
Newtown Creek, NY  
Buttermilk Channel, NY  
Bay Ridge and Red Hook Channels, NY  
Gowanus Creek Channel, NY  
Gowanus Canal, NY  
Gravesend Bay, NY  
Coney Island Channel, NY  
East Rockaway Inlet, NY  
Jamaica Bay, NY  
Raritan River, NJ  
Upper Bay, New York Harbor, NY and NJ  
Newark Bay, NJ  
Hackensack River, NJ  
Passaic River, NJ  
New York and New Jersey Channels, NY and NJ  
Raritan River to Arthur Kill Cutoff Channel, NJ  
New York Harbor, NY, Lower Entrance Channels

TABLE D-2. LOUISIANA INLAND WATERWAYS

1. Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mobile AL to New Orleans, LA
2. Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mississippi River to Sabine, TX
3. Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, New Orleans, LA
4. Mississippi River - Gulf Outlet, LA
5. Waterway from Empire, LA to Gulf of Mexico
6. Barataria Bay Waterway, LA
7. Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche-Jump Waterway, LA
8. Bayou Little Caillou, LA
9. Huma Navigation Canal, LA
10. Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Morgan City - Port Allen Route
11. Mermantau River and Bayous Nezpique and DesCannes, LA

TRIPS OF TANKERS, BARGES AND ALL VESSELS  
FOR FOUR U.S. COASTAL AREAS  
1974 THROUGH 1977

	1974	1975	1976	1977
NEW LONDON HARBOR AND THAMES RIVER, CT				
TANKERS	631	508	505	422
BARGES	1474	1251	959	713
ALL TYPES	20184	10792	14278	9179
CONNECTICUT RIVER BELOW HARTFORD, CT				
TANKERS	516	430	562	549
BARGES	1374	1172	917	697
ALL TYPES	67706	68143	66683	66488
NEW HAVEN HARBOR, CT				
TANKERS	1542	1308	1376	1243
BARGES	2014	2308	2007	2103
ALL TYPES	9283	8595	9010	8690
BRIDGEPORT HARBOR, CT				
TANKERS	209	223	192	191
BARGES	602	598	647	661
ALL TYPES	3746	3825	3876	3946
NORWALK HARBOR, CT				
TANKERS	90	80	77	69
BARGES	291	304	320	334
ALL TYPES	2340	2720	2768	3037
STAMFORD HARBOR, CT				
TANKERS	305	296	292	285
BARGES	281	244	224	193
ALL TYPES	2284	1999	1611	1292
OYSTER BAY, NY				
TANKERS	364	339	248	139
BARGES	214	172	184	189
ALL TYPES	2233	2110	2187	1686
PORT CHESTER, NY				
TANKERS	239	235	241	325
BARGES	37	70	62	43
ALL TYPES	879	921	792	840
PORT JEFFERSON, NY				
TANKERS	712	561	504	384
BARGES	911	1086	560	501
ALL TYPES	8970	9064	8715	8661
HEMPSTEAD HARBOR, NY				
TANKERS	505	435	199	74
BARGES	504	485	577	595
ALL TYPES	9774	7111	4284	1563
TOTALS, LONG ISLAND SOUND				
TANKERS	5113	4415	4196	3681
BARGES	7702	7760	6457	6029
ALL TYPES	127399	115289	114204	105382

PORT OF NEW YORK, TABLE D-1.

TANKERS	74187	63806	59994	51798
BARGES	93590	85666	84286	78498
ALL TYPES	793452	675907	616054	518187

HUDSON RIVER, DEEPWATER IN UPPER BAY TO WATERFORD, NY

TANKERS	2333	1904	1811	1494
BARGES	8534	7370	7738	7085
ALL TYPES	110884	92953	78930	62302

DELAWARE RIVER, TRENTON NJ TO THE SEA, CONSOLIDATED REPORT

TANKERS	5144	4501	4504	4076
BARGES	16483	13578	14262	12537
ALL TYPES	118807	119612	94907	87209

LOUISIANA INLAND WATERWAYS, TABLE D-2.

TANKERS	35	40	12	6
BARGES	75306	80464	78623	81448
ALL TYPES	337623	382947	407545	445954
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, NEW ORLEANS TO MOUTH OF PASSES				
TANKERS	4275	4702	4769	5076
BARGES	38717	41969	38218	39136
ALL TYPES	167652	173744	172361	175961
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO NEW ORLEANS				
TANKERS	2558	3110	3425	3898
BARGES	44381	48503	47049	49312
ALL VESSELS	152963	161751	175120	185435
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA				
TANKERS	605	584	693	715
BARGES	8746	8290	8506	8274
ALL VESSELS	30869	34128	38347	41926
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER, LA				
TANKERS	0	0	0	0
BARGES	4367	3405	5015	4910
ALL VESSELS	43608	47358	45391	47302

TOTALS, LOUISIANA COAST

TANKERS	7473	8436	8899	9695
BARGES	171517	182631	177411	183080
ALL TYPES	564973	799928	838764	896578

SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX				
TANKERS	3003	2691	3321	3323
BARGES	29639	28321	30520	30374
ALL VESSELS	70550	65592	71898	70695
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX				
TANKERS	3169	2984	3149	3081
BARGES	21439	19290	21232	20450
ALL VESSELS	66299	61545	69940	69569
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL, TX				
TANKERS	1017	1276	1321	1508
BARGES	11157	9792	10785	10205
ALL VESSELS	16753	14780	17054	16497
GALVESTON CHANNEL, TX				
TANKERS	242	225	203	184
BARGES	745	605	527	408
ALL VESSELS	5952	6464	6455	9460
FREETPORT HARBOR, TX				
TANKERS	721	575	704	650
BARGES	3562	2700	2911	2895
ALL VESSELS	8765	6767	7583	7360
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX				
TANKERS	9	6	15	16
BARGES	659	571	586	532
ALL VESSELS	2186	2201	2136	2124
GICWW, SABINE RIVER TO GALVESTON, TX				
TANKERS	102	99	110	112
BARGES	29212	28007	30039	29913
ALL VESSELS	59086	55687	62306	62246
GICWW, GALVESTON TO CORPUS CHRISTI, TX				
TANKERS	10	12	18	22
BARGES	14092	13010	12594	11734
ALL VESSELS	46142	45610	52254	54114
TOTALS, NORTH TEXAS COAST				
TANKERS	8273	7868	8841	8896
BARGES	110505	102305	109194	106511
ALL VESSELS	275733	258646	291626	292065



APPENDIX E  
A BRIEF DISCUSSION OF THREE TECHNIQUES  
TO ESTIMATE OIL SPILL RATES FROM HISTORIC DATA

The fundamental assumption made in the spill rate calculation to follow is that spills are a Poisson process on the exposure variable. This means that (Reference 14, p 14):

- (a) The probability of at least one spill occurring during exposure  $\Delta t$  approaches the value  $\lambda(\Delta t)$  as  $\Delta t$  approaches 0, where  $\lambda > 0$ .
- (b) The probability of two or more spills occurring during exposure  $\Delta t$  approaches 0 as  $\Delta t$  approaches 0.

It might be noted from (b) that collisions of oil-carrying vessels are not a Poisson process if they result in multiple spills; it is necessary to count the spills resulting from a collision as a single spill if they are to be considered part of a Poisson process.

Given the assumption of a Poisson process, the question arises: How does one estimate the spill rate parameter  $\lambda$  given several years of historic spill and exposure data? Three approaches will be discussed very briefly, in order of decreasing complexity.

1) Maximum Likelihood Estimate

The idea behind this approach is to choose  $\lambda$  so as to maximize the probability of the actually observed spills. By the Poisson assumption, the probability of  $n_i$  spills in exposure  $t_i$  is  $P_i$ , and the probability of the set of observations is  $P$ :

$$P_i = (\lambda t_i)^{n_i} \frac{e^{-\lambda t_i}}{n_i!}, \quad P = \prod_i P_i \quad (E-1)$$

This rate  $\lambda$  may be selected so as to maximize  $P$  for, say,  $i = 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977$ . The result is

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\lambda t_i - n_i) = 0, \quad (E-2)$$

which will be seen to be identical to that of the next approach to be discussed.

## 2) Posterior/Prior Analysis

This approach is described in Reference 4. The authors start out with the assumption that, prior to the incorporation of the  $n_i, t_i$  data, the spill rate  $\lambda$  has a Gamma distribution

$$f(\lambda) = e^{-\lambda\omega} (\lambda\omega)^{c-1} \omega / (c-1)! \quad (E-3)$$

with both parameters  $c$  and  $\omega$  approaching zero. This essentially distributes  $\lambda$  uniformly everywhere on the positive axis, corresponding to almost complete ignorance.

When the observational data  $n_i, t_i$  are available, the new (posterior) distribution of  $\lambda$  may be calculated:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\lambda/n_i, t_i) &= f(n_i/\lambda, t_i) f(\lambda) / f(n_i/t_i) \\ &= f(n_i/\lambda, t_i) f(\lambda) / \int f(n_i/\lambda, t_i) f(\lambda) d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

The distribution  $f(n_i/\lambda, t_i)$  is now assumed to be Poisson, and the prior distribution  $f(\lambda)$  is the Gamma assumed above. When these two functions are put into the right side and simplified the result is

$$f(\lambda/n_i, t_i) = [\lambda(\omega+t_i)]^{n_i+c} e^{-\lambda(\omega+t_i)} / \lambda! (n_i+c-1)!$$

which, when evaluated at  $c = \omega = 0$ , is

$$f(\lambda/n_i, t_i) = (\lambda t_i)^{n_i-1} e^{-\lambda t_i} / (n_i-1)!$$

Thus when the data  $n_i, t_i$  are incorporated the distribution of the spill rate  $\lambda$  is again a Gamma. This process obviously may be repeated with the same result as new data ( $n_i, t_i$ ;  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ ) become available.

At this point in the development one has an estimate not simply of  $\lambda$ , but of its entire posterior probability density distribution. The authors proceed to derive from it a prediction or distribution of the probability of observing a given number of spills in a given future exposure. But if only an estimate of the spill rate  $\lambda$  is required, the above distribution  $f(\lambda/n_i, t_i)$  is completely adequate. From it any number of estimates of  $\lambda$  may be derived, (e.g., the mean, the mode, the median). The simplest, perhaps, is the mean  $\bar{\lambda}$  which is just the ratio of spills observed to exposure observed. For the  $i$ th year this is

$$\bar{\lambda}_i = n_i/t_i,$$

while for all years together it is  $\bar{\lambda}$

$$\bar{\lambda} = (\sum_i n_i)/(\sum_i t_i).$$

This is the same result as obtained from the maximum likelihood estimate (1) above.

### 5) Least-Squares Fit

If cumulative spills are regressed against cumulative oil movement the slope of the resulting line is an approximation to the spill rate of the underlying Poisson process. As the amount of data increases the slope approaches the spill rate  $\lambda$ .

In fitting a straight line to the cumulative data, the origin may be considered a valid data point, i.e., the cumulative spills and cumulative oil flow may be taken as zero before any data are accumulated. This point is valid for the same reason that the cumulative data for intermediate days in the year, if they were available, would be acceptable points.

Because it is generally accepted and easy to apply, the slope of the linear regression to the cumulative data is commonly employed as an estimate of the spill rate.

## Discussion

It is instructive to compare the posterior estimator with the least square fit. The two are illustrated in Figure E-1, using fictitious data points for emphasis. It is seen that:

- (a) The posterior estimate  $\bar{\lambda}$  is the slope of the straight line joining the origin with the last (cumulative) point. The least square straight line, on the other hand, need not pass through either the origin or the last point.
- (b) The least square fit depends upon the order in which the  $(n_i, t_i)$  data are taken, while  $\bar{\lambda}$  is independent of the order. This is a consequence of the next observation.
- (c) The posterior estimator assumes a Poisson spill process relative to the exposure variable; the least square fit requires no assumption about the spill process.
- (d) As the amount of data increases, the least square fit approaches the prior/posterior estimator.

Because of (4), least-square fit does not differ greatly from the posterior estimator in practical situations in which there are a large number of data points. For example, the two estimates were found to agree to within 1/2% for 80 data points representing the U. S. oil spill rate (spills over 50,000 gallons) from 1974-77. Since the posterior estimator is simpler to calculate than the least square fit, and because it is the same as the maximum likelihood estimate, it is employed exclusively in the body of this report.




FIGURE E-1. ILLUSTRATION OF TWO SPILL RATE ESTIMATION TECHNIQUES

## APPENDIX F

### SIGNIFICANCE TESTING FOR POISSON PROCESSES

If spills occur according to a Poisson law then it is of considerable interest to determine whether the spill rate indicated by one set of data is significantly different from the spill rate indicated by another set of data. Methods to do so are discussed in Reference 22, Chapter 9. The following analysis is a simplified discussion of the relevant portions of that reference.

Assume  $n_1$  events are observed from a Poisson process with exposure  $t_1$ , and  $n_2$  events are observed from another Poisson process having exposure  $t_2$ . It is desired to determine if the number of events observed in the second process is significantly different from the number in the first process. Let the null hypothesis be that both processes have the same rate  $\lambda$ . It is then necessary to calculate the probability of observing  $n_2$  events in exposure  $t_2$  given that a total of  $n_1 + n_2$  events are observed in exposure  $t_1 + t_2$ . As shown in Reference 22, this reduces to the calculation of the binomial probability that, in  $n_1 + n_2$  trials, exactly  $n_2$  will fall into the exposure interval  $t_2$ , when the probability for each trial is  $\theta$ :

$$P(n_2/n_1+n_2) = \binom{n_1+n_2}{n_2} \theta^{n_2} (1-\theta)^{n_1}, \quad (F-1)$$

where

$$\theta = t_2/(t_2+t_1). \quad (F-2)$$

In other words, if both processes have the same occurrence rate, the ratio (2) gives the probability that any one of the events falls into the exposure interval  $t_2$ . Therefore (1) gives the probability that exactly  $n_2$  events fall into the interval  $t_2$ .

The above formulation has the advantage that it does not require a hypothesis regarding the process rate  $\lambda$ , but only the hypothesis that it is the same for both intervals. Thus by giving the exposure intervals  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ , and the observations  $n_1$  and  $n_2$ ,

one can obtain the probability of the observed number of events  $n_2$ . By taking the sum

$$P(X > n_2 / n_1 + n_2) = \sum_{x=n_2}^{x=\infty} \binom{n_1+x}{x} \epsilon^x (1-\epsilon)^{n_1},$$

one may be able to determine whether the observation  $n_2$  is inconsistent with the hypothesis of equal process rates.

If  $n (=n_1 + n_2)$  is greater than, say, 30 the binomial function (1) cannot be readily computed, being the sum of numerous small terms. In that case, however, the binomial may be approximated by the normal distribution, (Ref.18). The number  $n_2$ , of events expected in exposure  $t_2$  is normally distributed about the mean

$$n\theta$$

with variance

$$n\theta(1 - \theta),$$

where  $n = n_1 + n_2$  and  $\theta = c/(1 + c)$ , with  $c$  equal to the ratio  $\lambda_2 t_2 / \lambda_1 t_1$ . If it is hypothesized that  $\lambda_2 = \lambda_1 = \lambda_0$ , i.e., that both processes have the same rate, then

$$\theta = t_2 / (t_1 + t_2),$$

and the distribution of  $n_2$ , given  $n_1 + n_2$  events in toto, can be calculated without any specific assumption on  $\lambda_0$ .

APPENDIX G  
OIL SPILL RATES IN SELECTED WESTERN RIVERS

1. INTRODUCTION

This appendix develops oil spill rates for the major Western Rivers. It serves for comparison with the spill rates in four Coastal areas (New York, Delaware Bay, Louisiana Coast, N. Texas Coast) that were investigated in the final report to which this appendix is attached.

The method followed in this appendix is similar to that employed in the main part of the report: first, the study area is defined, then the data base of spills is described, followed by the oil movement data, and concluding with the calculation and discussion of the spill rates that result.

2. STUDY AREA

The rivers covered in this appendix are those Western Rivers that carry 500,000 tons or more of oil and oil products annually. They are:

- a. Lower Mississippi, from mouth of Ohio River up to and not including Baton Rouge LA.
- b. Upper Mississippi, Minneapolis MN to mouth of Ohio River,
- c. Illinois River, from Lockport IL to mouth.
- d. Ohio River System as follows
  - Ohio River, from Pittsburgh PA to mouth of river.
  - Cumberland River, mouth to mile 552.
  - Tennessee River, mouth to Knoxville TN.
  - Allegheny River, Pittsburgh PA to above East Brady PA.



- Monongahela River, Pittsburgh PA to Fairmont WV.
- Kanawha River, mouth to mile 90.57 (head of navigation).

### 3. SPILL DATA

The spill data were obtained from the Pollution Incident Reporting System (PIRS), from the National Response Center (NRC) files and from the Commercial Vessel Casualty File, (CVCF), all of the U.S. Coast Guard. All spills of oil or oil products of 10,000 gallons or more from January 1974 through December 1977 contained in those records were extracted and tabulated (see Table A-1.), if they occurred in or near any of the rivers in the study region. A spill was judged to be "near" a river if it occurred within 2 miles of the river or in a city or town contiguous to the river. In practice, only one of the 36 spills (NRC #109-77) occurred near but not in one of the rivers.

In addition to the 36 recorded spills listed as within the bounds of the study, there were found to be four others that would be included except for an uncertainty in the amount spilled, and twenty others that would be included except for some uncertainty in their exact location. These are listed in Table A-2.

The four spills with uncertain quantity of oil spilled originated in the CVCF computer listing, having there a pollution indicator of 1 (light pollution). For the reasons outlined in the accompanying memorandum, these were considered as possible rather than confirmed spills. One CVCF spill was considered a confirmed spill, and included in the total, because it bore a pollution indicator of 2 (medium pollution).

The twenty spills with uncertain location originated in the PIRS listings, having there only the state as an indication of location. All of these spills are recorded as inland in a non-navigable tributary to navigable water or in an inland river, canal, or other restricted navigable waterway. All twenty were recorded in 1974 or 1975.

An analysis of Table A-1 yields a breakdown by River System and spill type (i.e., source code), shown in Table A-3. The source code classification employed in Table A-3 is as follows:

TABLE A-1. LIST OF SPILLS IN SELECTED WESTERN RIVERS, 1974-1977 (10,000 GALLONS OR MORE OF OIL OR OIL PRODUCTS)

COL 1 TWO DIGITS EACH FOR YEAR, MONTH, DAY, HOUR FOLLOWED BY ONE DIGIT TO INDICATE MULTIPLE SIMULTANEOUS SPILLS AND ONE DIGIT TO INDICATE CARD NUMBER 1 OR 2.  
 COL 2 LATITUDE AND LONGITUDE OR RIVER AND MILE, AS PER PIRS CODING MANUAL, CG-450, FEB 1976.  
 COL 3 WATER BODY NAME, WHEN AVAILABLE.  
 COL 4 NEAREST CITY, TOWN OR GEOGRAPHIC FEATURE.  
 COL 5-7 CASE NUMBERS.

COL 1	DATE/TIME	2	LOCATION	3	WATER BODY	4	CITY/STATE	5	PIRS	6	NRC	7	VCF
WESTERN RIVERS - 1													
7403032301	R	LM	06695	MISSISSIPPI	RIVER	TUNICA	MS	0800112					
7407190011	R	LM	03633	MISSISSIPPI	RIVER	NATCHEZ	LA	0801836					
7503030101	R	LM	06395	MISSISSIPPI	RIVER	HELENA	AR	0200137					
7502051911	R	LM	04358	MISSISSIPPI	RIVER	VICKSBURG	MS	0202707	320-75			60496	
7511120011	R	LM	07380	MISSISSIPPI	RIVER	MEMPHIS	IN					60864	
7511130021	R	LM	05310	MISSISSIPPI	RIVER	GREFNVILL	MS					63662	
7612200011	R	LM	07200	MISSISSIPPI	RIVER	MEMPHIS	IN					72469	
7701042301	R	LM	09520	MISSISSIPPI	RIVER		KY	0200020					
7703300011	R	LM	07850	MISSISSIPPI	RIVER	MEMPHIS	IN					72467	
7706190011	R	LM	07550	MISSISSIPPI	RIVER	MEMPHIS	IN					73596	
7701291001	R	UM	01761	MISSISSIPPI	RIVER	SAINI LOUIS	MO			287-75			
7701120801	R	UM	02000	MISSISSIPPI	RIVER	ALION	IL	0200590					
7711300301	R	UM	01940	MISSISSIPPI	RIVER	ALION	IL	1170 521-75					
7603121001	R	UM	01800	MISSISSIPPI	RIVER	SAINI LOUIS	IL	0200215	83-76				
7701101201	R	UM	00423	MISSISSIPPI	RIVER	CAPEGIRADEAU	MO	0200014	17-77				
7702122201	R	UM	00505	MISSISSIPPI	RIVER	CAPEGIRADEAU	MO			44-77			
7704021001	R	UM	01758	MISSISSIPPI	RIVER	SAINI LOUIS	MO	02000309	76-77				
7705072301	R	UM	00166	MISSISSIPPI	RIVER	CAIRO	IL			94-77			
7407030021	R	IL	02750	ILLINOIS	WATERWAY	JOLIET	IL					53063	
7408041401	R	IL	01390	ILLINOIS	RIVER	BANNER	IL	0200532	2-75				
7505100101	R	IL	00710	ILLINOIS	RIVER	MEREDOSIA	IL	0200399	380-75				

7602082201	R	IL	01873	ILLINOIS RIVER	LACON	IL	36-76
7404252101	R	OH	09389	OHIO RIVER	CAIRO (CUMBER)	IL	0200230
7405231501	R	OH	04696	OHIO/LICKING RIVER	CINCINNATI	OH	0200310
7412121601	R	OH	01729	OHIO RIVER	MARIETTA	OH	239-75
7502050401	R	OH	04910	OHIO RIVER	CINCINNATI	OH	0200070
7502101301	R	OH	00195	OHIO RIVER	ALIQUIPPA	PA	0200078
7503011401	R	OH	00108	OHIO RIVER	PITTSBURGH	PA	0200133
7503080901	R	MH	09005	MONONGHELA RIVER	PITTSBURGH	PA	0200136
7510071721	R	OH	08096	OHIO RIVER	EVANSVILLE	IN	324-75
7512041001	R	OH	00220	OHIO RIVER	CONWAY	PA	0201243
7604081101	R	CH	01943	SIMS CREEK	NASHVILLE	TN	0200370
7604090801	R	MH	00050	MONONGHELA RIVER	PITTSBURGH	PA	0200428
7608090701	R	AL	00720	ALLEGHENY RIVER	EAST BRADY	PA	170-76
7701130201	R	OH	04858	OHIO RIVER	CINCINNATI	OH	0200016
7703050401	R	OH	06040	OHIO RIVER	LOUISVILLE	KY	57-77
7704050601	R	OH	06042	OHIO RIVER	LOUISVILLE	KY	0200259
7706052001	R	OH	09400	HARMON CREEK	WEIRION	WV	109-77
7712071201	R	OH	04526	OHIO RIVER	RIPLEY	OH	0201385
7712091501	R	OH	01747	OHIO RIVER	MARIETTA	OH	0201551

TABLE A-1. (CONTINUED)

COL 9	SOURCE TYPE CODE, AS PER PIRS CODING MANUAL CG-450.
COL 10	NAME OF SOURCE, WHEN AVAILABLE.
COL 11	IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF SOURCE. THIS IS USUALLY VESSEL NUMBER.
COL 12	CALL SIGN OR OTHER NUMBER RECORDED IN PIRS FILE. CAUSE/FACTOR CODE LETTERS AND DESCRIPTION, ASSIGNED ACCORDING TO PIRS CODING MANUAL, CG-450.
COL 13	PIRS CODE FOR OIL TYPE.
COL 14	QUANTITY OF OIL SPILLED, IN THOUSANDS OF GALLONS, FOLLOWED BY LETTER INDICATING SOURCE OF ESTIMATE <sup>9</sup> P=PIRS, N=NRC, V=VCF. THE LETTERS LV, MV, HV INDICATE LIGHT, MEDIUM, AND HEAVY POLLUTION INDICATORS IN THE VCF COMPUTER FILE.

COL 8	DATE/TIME	SOURCE	9	TYPE	10	NAME	11	ID	12	CAUSE/FACTOR	13	OIL	14	QTY
		WESTERN RIVERS	- 2											
	7403032302	034	TNK	BARG			ON518273	AB	HLLRPT	GROUNDG	1011		21P	
	7407190012	401	ONS	PPLN			00007946	CA	PPLRPT	COLLISN	1000		13P	
	7503030102	034	TNK	BARG			ON510940	AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN	1011		840P	
	7503051912	034	TNK	BARG		3TB+1TG	ON287014	AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN	1000		1027P	160N
	7511120012	052	TUG	BOAT		MVWHITGLD	ON256109	AQ	HLLRPT	EXP-FIR			LV	
	7511130022	034	TNK	BARG		T-B R924	ON550414	AQ	HLLRPT	EXP-FIR			NV	
	7612270012	052	TUG	BOAT		MVSTFOSTER	ON255920	AB	HLLRPT	GROUNDG				
	7701042302	034	TNK	BARG			ON511359	AB	HLLRPT	GROUNDG	1022		21P	
	7703300012	03	TNK	BARG		TBCHUBBY	ON513601	AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN			LV	
	7706190012	052	TUG	BOAT		MV DEL RIO	ON264305	ZB	FIRE	GROUNDG			LV	
	7501291002	03	TNK	BARG		T-B JDS303		AQ	HLLRPT	UNKNOWN	1010		18N	
	7507120802	034	TNK	BARG			ON262757	AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN	1011		10P	
	7511300302	035	TNK	BARG		T-B B242	ON290662	BB	TNKRPT	GROUNDG	1040		28P	23N
	7603121002	034	TNK	BARG		T-BMTVERNN	ON299026	BA	TNKRPT	COLLISN	1011		10P	10P
	7701101202	035	TNK	BARG		TB T-250SL	ON270758	AB	HLLRPT	GROUNDG	1052		40P	50N
	7702122202	03	TNK	BARG		T/BT-150SL		BB	TNKRPT	GROUNDG	1052		38N	38N
	7704021002	101	ONS	CGTR		STORAGTANK	98588329	ND	PMPFLR	MAT-FLT	1040		17P	17N
	7705072302	03	TNK	BARG		T/R LBT50		BC	TNKRPT	CORROSN	1001		30N	30N
	7407030022	03	TNK	BARG		TBKENTUCKY	ON262829	AB	HLLRPT	GROUNDG			NV	
	7408041402	034	TNK	BARG			ON515189	AA	HLLRPT	COLLISN	1040		88P	92N
	7505100102	401	ONS	PPLN		(PIPELINE)	00088329	WK	OTHER	UNKNOWN	1000		217P	

7602082202	034	TNK	BARG	TR FLORIDA		AB HLLRPT	GROUNDG	1020	225N
7404252102	052	TOW	BOAT		ON537344	AA HLLRPT	COLL1SN	1040	13P
7405231502	033	TNK	BARG		CG000083	AA HLLRPT	COLL1SN	1021	74P
7412121602	502	ONS	STFY			BQ TNKRPT	UNKNOWN	1040	35N
7502050402	034	TNK	BARG		ON261395	AQ HLLRPT	UNKNOWN	1040	82P
7502101302	503	ONS	PRFY		55400033	WE OVRFLD	ERROR	1000	45P
7503011402	502	ONS	STFY		00088329	SK TNKOFO	UNKNOWN	1010	12P
7503080902	052	TUG	BOAT	ONWARD	ON241256	RB EQPFLR	XSVWEAR	1095	10P
7510071722	034	TNK	BARG	BARGE2181	ON504963	AB HLLRPT	GROUNDG	1040	84P
7512041002	301	RWY	CGTR	STORAGETNK	00068740	CQ PPLRPT	UNKNOWN	1040	100P
7604081102	508	NTR	PPLN	STORAGTANK	00000042	IP PIPRPT	UNKNOWN	1040	38P
7604090802	302	RWY	FLFY	STORAGTANK	00018740	TG IMOPN	VLV-OPN	1041	150P
7608090702	201	RWY	LQBK	R-RTNKCARS	00000040	QF RRDACD	UNKNOWN	1001	180N
7701130202	401	ONS	PPLN		89540729	CJ PIPRPT	MAT-FLT	1011	13P
7703050402	03	TNK	BARG	TBEXNEB218		BA TNKRPT	COLL1SN	1095	13N
7704050602	034	TNK	BARG	T/BHINES360	000043544	AB HLLRPT	GROUNDG	1011	75P
7706052002	503	ONS	PRFY	HOLDNGPOND	00000033	HQ STRFLR	UNKNOWN	1080	
7712071202	507	PWR	PLNT		00000049	IC PIPRPT	CORROSN	1040	15P
7712091502	033	TNK	BARG		CG0000620	AF HLLRPT	OTHER	1011	26P

TABLE A-2. LIST OF SPILLS POSSIBLY QUALIFYING FOR TABLE A-1.

COL 1 TWO DIGITS EACH FOR YEAR, MONTH, DAY, HOUR FOLLOWED BY ONE DIGIT TO INDICATE MULTIPLE SIMULTANEOUS SPILLS AND ONE DIGIT TO INDICATE CARD NUMBER 1 OR 2.

COL 2 LATITUDE AND LONGITUDE OR RIVER AND MILE, AS PER PIRS CODING MANUAL, CG-450, FEB 1976.

COL 3 WATER BODY NAME, WHEN AVAILABLE.

COL 4 NEAREST CITY, TOWN OR GEOGRAPHIC FEATURE.

COL 5-7 CASE NUMBERS.

COL 1 DATE/TIME	2 LOCATION	3 WATER BODY	4 CITY/STATE	5 PIRS	6 NRC	7 VCF
1974-77	LOCATION OR QUANTITY UNCERTAIN					
7401141801			AR	880		
7401171801			KY	257		
7401260201			TN	232		
7402161101			MO	283		
7403280701			KY	658		
7406031501			OH	334		
7406071001			TN	675		
7406111201			AR	717		
7406211801			WV	381		
7407121001			OH	890		
7408020701			IL	755		
7411161201			AR	1110		
7412110701			AR	1109		
7501171201			AP	672		
7501241201			OH	232		
7504051201			IL	187		
7506271601			WI	592		
7505202101			TN	314		
7506211601			MN	805		
7512041601			OH	1232		

TABLE A-2. (CONTINUED)

COL 9 SOURCE TYPE CODE, AS PER PIRS CODING MANUAL CG-450.  
 COL 10 NAME OF SOURCE, WHEN AVAILABLE.  
 COL 11 IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF SOURCE. THIS IS USUALLY VESSEL NUMBER.  
 CALL SIGN OR OTHER NUMBER RECORDED IN PIRS FILE.  
 COL 12 CAUSE/FACTOR CODE LETTERS AND DESCRIPTION, ASSIGNED ACCORDING TO PIRS CODING MANUAL, CG-450.  
 COL 13 PIRS CODE FOR OIL TYPE.  
 COL 14 QUANTITY OF OIL SPILLED, IN THOUSANDS OF GALLONS, FOLLOWED BY LETTER INDICATING SOURCE OF ESTIMATE<sup>9</sup> P=PIRS, N=NRC, V=VCF. THE LETTERS LV, MV, HV INDICATE LIGHT, MEDIUM, AND HEAVY POLLUTION INDICATORS IN THE VCF COMPUTER FILE.

COL 8 DATE/TIME	9 SOURCE	10 NAME	11 ID	12 CAUSE/FACTOR	13 OIL	14 QTY
7401141802	401	ONS	PPLN	PIPRPT	CORROSN	1001
7401171802	401	ONS	PPLN	NATURL	OTHER	1001
7401260202	502	ONS	STFY	TNKOFI	OVR-FLL	1040
7402161102	401	ONS	PPLN	PIPRPT	PIP-CUT	1001
7403280702	401	ONS	PPLN	PIPRPT	CORROSN	1001
7406031502	201	RRD	BKVL	TNKRPT	OVRTURN	1000
7406071002	401	ONS	PPLN	VLVFLR	IMP-OPN	1001
7406111202	401	ONS	PPLN	NATURL	OTHER	1001
7406211802	401	ONS	PPLN	PIPRPT	CORROSN	1000
7407121002	502	ONS	STFY	INTDCH	SAB-VAN	1001
7408020702	401	ONS	PPLN	PIPRPT	CORROSN	1001
7411161202	401	ONS	PPLN	PIPRPT	CORROSN	1001
7412110702	504	ONS	PRFY	PIPRPT	IMP-MTN	1001
7501171202	401	ONS	PPLN	PIPRPT	PIP-CUT	1001
7501241202	401	ONS	PPLN	PIPRPT	CORROSN	1010
7504051202	503	ONS	PRFY	INTDCH	SAB-VAN	1097
7504271602	502	ONS	STFY	TNKRPT	WEATHER	1095
7505202102	503	ONS	PRFY	INTDCH	SAB-VAN	1040
7506211602	401	ONS	PPLN	PIPRPT	PIP-CUT	1011
7512041602	502	ONS	STFY	PIPRPT	OTHER	1022
66532729	IC	PIPRPT	CORROSN	1001		21P
33307929	YE	NATURL	OTHER	1001		12P
33334630	SE	TNKOFI	OVR-FLL	1040		84P
55504929	IH	PIPRPT	PIP-CUT	1001		21P
44407929	IC	PIPRPT	CORROSN	1001		10P
00000040	BD	TNKRPT	OVRTURN	1000		20P
00000013	MJ	VLVFLR	IMP-OPN	1001		13P
00000046	YE	NATURL	OTHER	1001		15P
30000046	IC	PIPRPT	CORROSN	1000		15P
77700046	XG	INTDCH	SAB-VAN	1001		14P
88804929	IC	PIPRPT	CORROSN	1001		42P
55553729	IC	PIPRPT	CORROSN	1001		15P
00070029	IG	PIPRPT	IMP-MTN	1001		19P
44400029	IH	PIPRPT	PIP-CUT	1001		23P
88800046	IC	PIPRPT	CORROSN	1010		13P
00000049	XG	INTDCH	SAB-VAN	1097		14P
00000089	BG	TNKRPT	WEATHER	1095		12P
00000028	XG	INTDCH	SAB-VAN	1040		12P
99904929	IH	PIPRPT	PIP-CUT	1011		106P
00000046	CQ	PIPRPT	OTHER	1022		40P



TABLE A-5. ANALYSIS OF SPILLS OF TABLE A-1  
BY RIVER SYSTEM AND SOURCE

<u>Spill Source</u>	River System				Total
	Lower MR	Upper MR	Illinois	Ohio	
Vessel-Related	5	7	3	8	23
Marine Facility	0	1	0	0	1
Onshore	1	0	1	10	12
<u>Year</u>					
1974	2	0	2	3	7
1975	3	3	1	6	13
1976	0	1	1	3	5
1977	1	4	0	6	11

Vessel-Related Spills: PIRS source codes 000 through 058

Marine Facility Spills: PIRS source codes 100 through 108,  
and 505

Onshore Spills: All other PIRS source codes, except 506 and  
402, which are offshore drilling and production spills

Table A-5 also breaks down spills by year and source type.

#### 4. EXPOSURE DATA

The exposure variable employed is millions of tons of oil movement on the selected rivers as recorded for 1974 through 1977 by the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), "Waterborne Commerce of the United States." The data are given in Table A-4, which has been extracted from Part 2 of the ACOE volumes. The total movement of light, heavy and crude for the four river systems in 1974 through 1977 are:

Lower Mississippi.....	102,008,000 tons
Upper Mississippi.....	90,057,000
Illinois.....	23,829,000
Ohio.....	122,459,000.

It should be noted that these totals include through oil movement as well as landed and loaded oil. Thus, oil that passes from, say, Baton Rouge through the Lower Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, to be unloaded on the Allegheny, is counted three times: once for its passage through the Lower Mississippi, once for its passage through the Ohio, and once for its receipt on the Allegheny. This multiple counting allows for the added exposure of through passage, and also allows the necessary breakdown of oil movement by river system.

TABLE A-4. OIL MOVEMENT IN 1974-77 ON SELECTED WESTERN RIVERS, THOUSANDS OF SHORT TONS

	1974	1975	1976	1977
MISSISSIPPI RIVER - MOUTH OF OHIO TO BUT NOT INCLUDING BATON ROUGE				
CRUDE	3178	4346	4773	3688
LIGHT	11758	11259	13814	13877
HEAVY	9581	8103	8074	9557
MISSISSIPPI RIVER - MINNEAPOLIS TO MOUTH OF MISSOURI				
CRUDE	503	256	848	752
LIGHT	6572	6635	6751	10033
HEAVY	4250	4447	4436	4314
MISSISSIPPI RIVER - MOUTH OF MISSOURI TO MOUTH OF OHIO				
CRUDE	414	219	860	752
LIGHT	5028	5288	6024	5250
HEAVY	4238	4175	4129	3883
TOTAL, UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER - MINNEAPOLIS TO MOUTH OF OHIO				
CRUDE	917	475	1708	1504
LIGHT	11600	11923	12775	15283
HEAVY	8488	8622	8565	8197
ILLINOIS RIVER, LOCKPORT IL TO MOUTH				
CRUDE	65	42	175	140
LIGHT	3258	2824	3069	2879
HEAVY	3443	2973	2578	2383
OHIO RIVER, MOUTH TO PITTSBURGH, PA				
CRUDE	644	867	883	406
LIGHT	15780	15774	15928	15350
HEAVY	5728	5391	5257	6303
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PITTSBURGH PA TO ABOVE FAST BRADY, PA				
CRUDE	2	00	3	00
LIGHT	328	404	230	213
HEAVY	469	421	414	451
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PITTSBURGH PA TO FAIRMONT, WV				
CRUDE	2	00	00	47
LIGHT	1591	773	1742	1606
HEAVY	1110	1650	628	888
KANAWHA RIVER, MOUTH TO HEAD OF NAVIGATION (MILE 90.57*)				
CRUDE	1	00	00	
LIGHT	954	1075	1104	1040
HEAVY	24	46	24	30
CUMBERLAND RIVER, MOUTH TO MILE 552				
CRUDE	00	3	00	00
LIGHT	727	967	1267	1049
HEAVY	252	271	271	440
TENNESSEE RIVER, MOUTH TO KNOXVILLE, TN				
CRUDE	1	1	3	12
LIGHT	1214	1676	2057	1911
HEAVY	861	1119	1189	1578
TOTAL, OHIO RIVER SYSTEM				
CRUDE	650	871	880	465
LIGHT	20594	20660	22328	21169
HEAVY	8444	8007	7783	9590

## 5. SPILL RATES

Spills per million tons are calculated in Table A-5 for vessel-related spills and other spills. One observes a high spill rate for the Illinois River System, both for vessel-related spills and for non-vessel-related spills. Also, the Ohio River System shows a high rate for non-vessel-related spills. The significance of these rates is difficult to judge without tests, because of the relatively few number of spills involved. Also, the existence of 24 additional spills, that may or may not be assignable to the various river systems, adds further to the uncertainty of the calculated spill rates.

### Significance Tests

Table A-6 shows the results of significance testing on the spill data of Table A-5.

The tests of Appendix F with normal approximation were employed for vessel-related spills. They show no significant deviation of the observed number of spills from the expected number, as seen by the relatively high probabilities in the last column.

A different significance test was applied to non-vessel-related spills because of the small number of spills (13) involved in total. The test employed is described in section 5.3 of the accompanying final report in connection with Table 5.6. The results, given in the last column of Table A-6, show that only the Ohio River System has significant deviation from the expected number of spills, having an observation probability of .02.

### Possible Spills

Before the deviation shown for the Ohio River System can be assessed fully, it is necessary to take account, if possible, of the 24 possibly relevant spills of Table A-2. Of these, 4 are vessel-related and 20 are not.

TABLE A-5. OIL SPILL RATES OF SELECTED  
WESTERN RIVERS, 1974-77

	SPILLS IN 1974-77	MILLIONS OF TONS, 1974-77	SPILLS PER MILLION TONS
VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS			
Lower Mississippi	5	102.0	.049
Upper Mississippi	7	90.1	.078
Illinois	5	25.8	.126
<u>Ohio</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>122.5</u>	<u>.065</u>
Total	25	338.4	.068
NON VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS			
Lower Mississippi	1	102.0	.010
Upper Mississippi	1	90.1	.011
Illinois	1	25.8	.042
<u>Ohio</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>122.5</u>	<u>.082</u>
Total	13	338.4	.038

TABLE A-6. SIGNIFICANCE TESTS OF SPILLS  
IN SELECTED WESTERN RIVERS  
1974-1977

	Observed Spills (1)	Expected Spills (2)	Expected Variance (3)	Probability of Observed Spills (4)
VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS				
Lower MR	5	6.9	4.84	.38
Upper MR	7	6.1	4.49	.67
Illinois	5	1.6	1.50	.25
<u>Ohio</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8.5</u>	5.51	.90
Total	23	23.0		
NON VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS				
			(5)	(6)
Lower MR	1	3.9	3.9	.20
Upper MR	1	3.5	3.5	.28
Illinois	1	0.9	0.9	.99
<u>Ohio</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>4.7</u>	<u>4.7</u>	<u>.02</u>
Total	13	13.0	---	---

(1) Taken from Table A-5.

(2) Based on a uniform spill rate, and oil movement for each river system shown in Table A-5.

(3) Calculated by method of Appendix F.

(4) Calculated by method of Appendix F, employing the normal approximation.

(5) Expected variance based on Poisson Distribution with mean of expected spills, column 2.

(6) Probability of any observation differing from the mean by an amount equal to or greater than the observation of column 1.

For most of these 24 spills, the possible river assignment is unique; for the remainder there are either 2 or 3 rivers to which an assignment may be made. A breakdown of possible spill assignments is given in Table A-7. It can be seen that the number of non-vessel-related spills that may be added to any of the four river systems exceeds the number of such spills actually known to have occurred in the river system. To determine whether the ten spills actually known to have occurred in the Ohio system is still significantly high when the effect of unassigned spills is allowed for, one may make an assignment of non-vessel-related spills from Table A-7 according to some assumed rules. For present purposes the rules adopted are, for each river system:

1. One half of non-vessel-related spills of type 1. in Table A-7 are assigned.
2. One-fourth of non-vessel-related spills of type 2. in Table A-7 are assigned.
3. One-sixth of non-vessel-related spills of type 3. in Table A-7 are assigned.

With the above rules, the number of observed spills is increased by assigned spills, as shown in Table A-8. The result of the significance tests, performed as before on non-vessel-related spills, is also shown in that table.

It is seen that the Ohio River System still shows significantly more spills than expected, but the significance level is 95% instead of 98%. This level of significance indicates that the Ohio River area probably has more non-vessel-related spills than normal even when the likely effects of possible other spills in the area are allowed for. It is apparent then, that the 24 spills possibly assignable to the river systems should be investigated individually in order to resolve with greater certainty the apparently high rate of non vessel-related spills in the Ohio River System. If the high spill rate is confirmed then a further investigation is required to determine its causes.

TABLE A-7. POSSIBLE SPILL ASSIGNMENTS TO ONE OR MORE OF THE FOUR WESTERN RIVER SYSTEMS

Number of Spills that could have occurred	River System <sup>(1)</sup>				Total
	LM	UM	IL	OH	
1. In one of the River Systems	9*	2	0	5	
2. In one of two River Systems	6	1	0	5	
3. In one of three River Systems	0	2	2	2	
Maximum Number of spills that could have occurred in the River System	15*	5	2	12	

\*Includes four vessel-related spills. All other spills are not vessel-related.

(1) Lower Mississippi, Upper Mississippi, Illinois, Ohio.



TABLE A-8. WORST CASE ANALYSIS OF OHIO RIVER  
NON-VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS

	Observed plus Assigned <u>Spills</u>	<u>Expected Spills</u>	<u>Expected Variance</u>	Probability of Observed & Assigned <u></u>
NON VESSEL-RELATED SPILLS				
Lower Mississippi	4.8	6.8	6.8	.57
Upper Mississippi	2.6	6.1	6.1	.30
Illinois	1.3	1.6	1.6	.99
Ohio	<u>14.1</u>	<u>8.3</u>	<u>8.3</u>	<u>.03</u>
	22.8	28.	---	---

## 6. RESULTS

The results of this study are based on a total of 36 spills over 10,000 gallons recorded in PIRS, NRC and VCF in the selected Western Rivers, from 1974 through 1977. In addition some 24 other spills are recorded that may have occurred in or near one of the selected rivers. The major results are:

- a. The number of vessel-related spills per million tons of oil movement shows no significant deviation from one river system to another.
- b. Vessel-related spills per million tons of oil movement in the Western Rivers are about equal to total spills per million ton of oil movement in the four coastal regions investigated in the final report.
- c. Non vessel-related spills per million tons of oil moved have no significant deviations among the selected Western Rivers, except for the Ohio River System.
- d. The non vessel-related spill rate in the Ohio River system appears to be about twice the rate in other parts of the Western Rivers. The significance level is 98%, but this significance level can be strongly affected by the 24 additional spills that may fall into the Western Rivers. (A trial assignment reduced the significance level to 95%). The exact location of these additional spills must be ascertained before a definite significance level can be estimated for the non-vessel-related spills in the Ohio River System.

## REFERENCES

1. Bender, A., G. Brown, Jr., and J. Rosenbusch, "Tank Barge Oil Pollution Study," Report No. CG-M-2-78, February 1978.
2. Charnes, A., W. Cooper, J. Harrold, K. Karwan, and W. Wallace, "A Goal Interval Programming Model for Resource Allocation in a Marine Environmental Protection Program," Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 3, 347-362(1976).
3. Devanney, J.W. and R.J. Stewart, "A Bayesian Approach to the Probability of Large Oil Spills: An Application of the Erlang Sampling Process." Report No. 73-16. Commodity Transportation and Economic Development Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, July 1973.
4. Devanney, J.W. and R.J. Stewart, "Bayesian Analysis of Oil Spill Statistics," Marine Technology, Vol. 365-382, October 1974.
5. MIT, Department of Ocean Engineering, "Primary Physical Impacts of Offshore Petroleum Developments," Report to the Council on Environmental Quality, Report No. MITSG 74-20 April 1974.
6. Stewart, R.J., "The Tanker/Pipeline Controversy," 1977 Oil Spill Conference, March 8-10, 1977, New Orleans.
7. Stewart, R.J., "Tankers in U.S. Waters," Ocean. (4), Fall 1977, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, MA.
8. Bellantoni, J.F. et al. Transportation Systems Center, U.S. Department of Transportation "Deployment Requirements for U.S. Coast Guard Pollution Response Equipment," September 1978. Report CG-D-63-78.
9. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, "Waterborne Commerce of the United States," Parts 1 through 4, 1974 through 1976.
10. Department of Transportation, Coast Guard, "Pollution Incident Reporting Systems, Coding Instruction Manual," CG-450, Feb. 1976.

11. Department of Transportation, Report of U.S. Coast Guard Task Force, "A Recommended Plan for Implementing Presidential Initiatives Concerning Oil Pollution Response," October 1979.
12. Department of Transportation, Coast Guard, "Supplemental Report to a Recommended Plan for Implementing Presidential Initiatives Concerning Oil Pollution Response," October 1979, NTIS AD-AO-67076.
13. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, "Waterborne Commerce of the United States, Part 5 National Summaries, 1974 through 1976."
14. Karlin, S., "A First Course in Stochastic Processes," Academic Press, New York, 1966.
15. Bland, R., Kalafus, R., Wisleder, R., et al. U.S. Department of Transportation, Research and Special Programs Administration, Transportation Systems Center, "Offshore Vessel Traffic Management (OVTM) Study," Final Report, August 1978, Report No. CG-D-55-78.
16. Lloyd's Weekly Casualty Reports, Lloyd's of London Press, Ltd.
17. Council on Environmental Quality, "National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan," Federal Register Part 40, November 28, Part 2, Title 40, Part 1510, February 1975.
18. Feller, W., "An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications," Vol I. Second Edition, Wiley, NY, 1957, p. 168 ff.
19. NMAC Study Group, U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, "Near Midair Collision Report of 1968," Air Traffic and Flight Standards Technical Report, July 1969, p. 79-80.
20. Dev R. Chaudhari, U.S. Department of Transportation, Coast Guard, "Analysis of the Coastal Tank Vessel and Barge Traffic," Final Report, April 1973, Report No. DOT-CG-23560-A.
21. U.S. Department of Transportation, Transportation Systems Center, "Pollution Response Systems Analysis, Documentation of Computer Programs," December 1978, material on file at DOT-TSC.

22. Cox, D.R. and P.A.W. Lewis, "The Statistical Analysis of Series of Events", Methuen, London, 1966, Chapter 9, p. 223-230.

**DAT  
FILM**

in the area are allowed for. It is apparent then, that the 24 spills possibly assignable to the river systems should be investigated individually in order to resolve with greater certainty the apparently high rate of non vessel-related spills in the Ohio River System. If the high spill rate is confirmed then a further investigation is required to determine its causes.

G-16

G-17



G-18

G-19/G-20

9. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, "Waterborne Commerce of the United States," Parts 1 through 4, 1974 through 1976.
10. Department of Transportation, Coast Guard, "Pollution Incident Reporting Systems, Coding Instruction Manual," CG-450, Feb. 1976.

R-1

20. Dev R. Chaudhari, U.S. Department of Transportation, Coast Guard, "Analysis of the Coastal Tank Vessel and Barge Traffic," Final Report, April 1973, Report No. DOT-CG-23560-A.
21. U.S. Department of Transportation, Transportation Systems Center, "Pollution Response Systems Analysis, Documentation of Computer Programs," December 1978, material on file at DOT-TSC.

R-3/R-4

DTIC